

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXLIX.]

MAY, 1857.

[Vol. XIII.]

IGNATIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH—HIS MARTYRDOM AND EPISTLES.*

WE have seen that Archbishop Usher entertained the hope that light might be thrown on the question respecting the Ignatian Epistles by the discovery of a Syriac version. Dr. John Fell, Dean of Christ Church and Bishop of Oxford, though now known chiefly by the unlucky rhyme into which his name has hitched, was a man of great learning, and especially devoted to theological studies, as was proved by his critical edition of the New Testament. Usher had been unable to procure a copy of the Syriac in Europe; Fell endeavoured to obtain it from the East; and for this purpose engaged the services of Huntington, the chaplain of the English factory at Aleppo. This accomplished orientalist, during the eleven years that he held the office, was employed by Dr. Narcissus Marsh, the Primate of Ireland, in collecting oriental MSS.; and Fell commissioned him to make researches for a Syriac Ignatius. Having applied unsuccessfully to the Patriarch of Antioch and the Archbishop of Mount Sinai, he undertook two journeys into Egypt, and in one of these actually visited the convent, from the library of which the long sought treasure has been ultimately obtained. The convent of St. Mary Deipara in the Nitrian desert stands in a valley which runs parallel with the western branch of the Nile, and is distant from it about thirty-five miles. It is commonly called the Valley of the Natron Lakes; the whole soil is so impregnated with saline particles, that it yields only a scanty vegetation, and by its dreary aspect it attracted those who began the ascetic life in Egypt. From them it has acquired the additional name of the Valley of Scete. The convent in question was founded by Syrian monks from Mesopotamia, flying probably from persecution, but the exact time or cause of their migration is not known. They brought with them a considerable number of Syriac MSS.; and in the year 936 A.D. the superior, Moses of Nisibis, made a journey to Bagdad and returned with an addition of 250 volumes. The monks were in a wretched state of ignorance and poverty, when attention was first drawn in recent times to the contents of their library. The

* Continued from p. 202.

Hon. Robert Curzon, who visited them in 1837,* found here twelve monks with a blind superior. Inquiring for their books, he was first taken to a high tower where some MSS. were hanging against the wall, and others, on vellum, were serving the purpose of covers to pots which had contained preserve or jam, and these he was allowed to take away. The monks protested that the books in this tower were all the monastery possessed; but Mr. Curzon had received private information that there were other MSS. in an oil cellar, and he managed to gain access to it. In all parts of the world it is understood that good eating and drinking tend much to the lubrication of business. The ascetics of the Natron Valley, he tells us, were proof against the attractions of a fat capon, before which the virtue of a Benedictine or a Capuchin might have given way, but they are great lovers of a pleasant *liqueur* called *rosoglio*. Having treated them to a few coffee-cups of it, Mr. Curzon introduced the subject of the oil cellar. The superior at first fought off his request to see it, but on the promise of another bottle of *rosoglio* on their return, he was conducted thither. The cellar was indeed full, as the superior had alleged, of empty oil jars; but Mr. Curzon discovered a side door, "leading to a low vaulted room, the floor of which was full, knee deep, of loose leaves of Syriac MSS." He was, however, specially in search of Coptic MSS., with which he filled his saddle-bags, having agreed with the monks about the price over the promised bottle of *rosoglio*.

The curiosity of the orientalists of Europe was now earnestly directed to the remaining treasures of the oil cellar.† The Rev. Henry Tattam, a Bedfordshire clergyman, had devoted himself to the study of the Coptic, and was anxious to enlarge the scanty materials which the existing MSS. yielded for his Grammar and Dictionary. A memorial was drawn up by a friend and neighbour, the Rev. T. Grimshawe, and signed by other Bedfordshire clergymen, representing to the government how beneficial to the cause of sacred literature it would be, if a grant were made to Mr. Tattam, to enable him to proceed to Egypt and make researches for Coptic MSS. Fortunately, Lord John Russell was at this time Secretary of State for the Home Department and leader of the House of Commons. A grant of £500 was obtained from the Treasury,‡ and Mr. Tattam, having proceeded to Egypt in the autumn of 1838, lost no time in visiting the Valley of the Natron Lakes. The monks of the Syrian convent at first denied that they had any books but those which he saw in the church; but finding that he was better informed, without the bribe of *rosoglio* they conducted him to the oil

* Visits to Monasteries in the Levant, c. vii.

† See Quarterly Review, Vol. LXXVII. p. 55.

‡ This is *not* mentioned in the Quarterly Review, from an intelligible motive.

cellar and the vault, and he agreed for the purchase of two Syriac MSS. which he brought away with him. On a second visit he obtained several more; and after his return to London, a further grant from the Treasury was made, and he undertook a second voyage to Egypt. This time he did not attempt to negotiate directly with the monks; but through the medium of a sheikh, living near the convent, he obtained nearly 200 volumes, or parts of volumes, among which, when they reached the British Museum, a copy was found of the three Epistles of Ignatius—to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans. Another copy of the same Epistles was found among the MSS. purchased from the same convent by M. Pacho, the traveller in the Cyrenaica, and by him sold to the British Museum. This institution now possesses the most valuable collection of Syriac MSS. in Europe, and Mr. Cureton has proved himself an admirable expounder of them. His works are learned, candid and clear.

And now the question may reasonably be asked, What new light has been thrown upon the Ignatian controversy of the seventeenth century? We answer, that it has for the first time obtained that *critical* test for the want of which the writers of that age were obliged to have recourse to much less certain criteria. Two MSS. have been found, probably not later than the fifth century, in which the text of the three Epistles—to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—is found in a much shorter form than even in the shorter recension of the Greek. And as Lardner thought it more probable that the larger had been interpolated by additions to the smaller, rather than the smaller abridged from the larger, so we may argue in favour of the Syriac and against the Greek. It was more probable that the Martyr should write seven letters than twelve, more probable that he should write seven short than seven long ones, more probable that he should write three than seven. A writer in the English Review indeed, who was unwilling to lose the testimony of the Greek letters to the early predominance of the Bishop, took the ground of maintaining that some Eutychian heretic had abridged the Greek original and translated it into Syriac; while Dr. Hefele, of Tübingen, thinks that some ascetic monk has left out all that was not of a pious and directly practical kind. Neither of these hypotheses is at all confirmed by the examination of the Syriac text. It gives no particular countenance to Eutychianism, and instead of that disjointed appearance which it would have presented had it undergone such an operation as Hefele supposes, it is better connected, more free from idle repetitions, and altogether more suitable to the character of the writer, than the Greek. Ordinarily when a question arises between the original and a translation, the presumption is in favour of the original; but in this case the general rule does not apply. We know that letters have been forged in the name of Ignatius; it is not denied

that the Greek text has been greatly tampered with by interpolation; it has therefore forfeited its claim to the authority of an original, and it may well happen that the text of the translation is the more authentic. If a Syrian monk, averse as monks often were to the control of the bishop, had mutilated the letters of Ignatius in order to deprive Episcopacy of his testimony, he has done his work imperfectly; for in the Syriac translation of the Epistle to Polycarp expressions are used respecting the bishop which, though they fall far short of the highflying language of the Greek Epistles, yet would not have been left by one who was systematically effacing everything that could exalt his authority.

Taking the three Epistles as they stand in the Syriac translation, we see then no reasonable ground for doubting that they proceeded from the pen of Ignatius. Bochart,* who was profoundly versed in the natural history of the ancients, objected to their genuineness that mention is made in them of *leopards*, a word, he says, which never occurs in Greek before the time of Constantine. But we think Bishop Pearson has satisfactorily answered this objection. That the word is not found in any author of an earlier age, is no proof that it was not in use, if we consider how much of ancient literature has been lost. In fact, Spartian, in his Life of Geta (c. v.), describes him as questioning the literati about him why different words were appropriated to the sounds made by different animals; "*cur leones rugiunt, leopardi rictant, porcelli grunniunt.*" Now Spartian wrote in the reign of Constantine; but if he has reported truly, the name of *leopard* must have been in use earlier. It was probably in use earlier in Syria than in the West; for the animal abounds in that country, and the Emperor Probus (Vopisc. xix.) exhibited in the arena a hundred Libyan leopards and a hundred Syrian. It was known to the Jews, as appears from the proverbial expression, "Can the leopard change his spots?" The word in the Syriac translation of Ignatius is the same as in Jerem. xiii. 23, *namar*.

Objections were taken by the critics of the seventeenth century to the genuineness of the Epistles, not only on the ground of their representing the power of the bishop as greater than it really was, but also because they contained allusions to heresies which did not exist in Ignatius' days. Thus in the Epistle to the Magnesians (ch. viii.) he says, "God has manifested himself by Jesus Christ, who is his eternal Word, not proceeding from silence" (*ἀπὸ σιγῆς*); and this has been held to be a clear allusion to the *Sige* of Valentinus, whose doctrines were not preached till the middle of the second century. This argument, though it may be embarrassing to those who maintain the genuineness of the Epistle to the Magnesians, has no weight against Mr.

* Hierozoic. i. 3, 8.

Cureton, who receives only the three which are contained in the Syriac translation. Again, there are evident allusions to the heresies of the Docetæ and the Phantasiastæ, who thought that Christ had suffered in appearance only. It is not quite so certain as in the case of Valentinus that these heresies did not exist in the age of Ignatius; but be that as it may, the objection does not touch the three Epistles existing in the Syriac, for in none of these do such allusions occur.

It may, however, be said, that it will not follow that Ignatius wrote only three Epistles, or that only three are genuine, because only three have been found in a Syriac translation, in a particular library. In the (Syriac) Epistle to the Romans he says, "I write to all the churches and instruct them all that I die willingly for God, if ye do not prevent me." This evidently alludes to various Epistles, written between the time of his condemnation and his writing to the Romans. The words will not prove that the Epistles which we now have are those which he actually wrote, but they afford a *prima facie* evidence in their favour. They shew that Epistles to the Magnesians, Trallians, &c., once existed—why not, in the main, such as we now have them? We think that Mr. Cureton pushes his negative argument too far. Only three Epistles have been found in two ancient MSS. But is it so extraordinary a thing for a MS. to contain only a portion of an author's works, that we are warranted in concluding everything spurious which two MSS. omit? How few MSS. contain the whole of the New Testament, or the Septuagint, or the Oration of Demosthenes, or the Epistles of Cicero! Clearly, without much fuller knowledge of what may once have existed in Syriac literature, we cannot argue that the primitive Syrian church recognized only three Epistles of Ignatius as genuine. That at one time it possessed others is evident, for Mr. Cureton's work contains fragments of Syriac translations of most of the Epistles mentioned by Eusebius. It is true that the allusions in Origen and Eusebius are to passages now found in the three Epistles, and this is a circumstance of considerable weight in their favour as exclusively genuine, but it is still subject to the uncertainty of a negative argument.

Mr. Cureton's conclusions, however, are so probable, that till stronger reasons are produced, we shall consider the Epistles to Polycarp, to the Romans, and to the Ephesians, as alone genuine, and proceed to consider what change this makes in opinions previously current.

1. Lardner in his *Credibility* has given an imposing array of fifty-five quotations from or allusions to the New Testament in the Epistles of Ignatius. This list suffers a great collapse if only three of them are genuine. In the Epistle to Polycarp he says, "Be thou prudent as the serpent in all things, and simple as the dove." This literally coincides with Matthew x. 16, but perhaps,

as the saying is proverbial, some doubt may exist as to its being a quotation. The supposed quotation from Matthew xii. 33, in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xiv.), "the tree is known by its fruit," does not appear in the Syriac; nor the allusion to Matt. xviii. 19, in ch. v. of the same Epistle, "If the prayer of one or two be of such force, how much more that of the bishop and the whole church?" nor the quotations from 1 Cor. i. 10 and vi. 9, 10, in ch. xviii. and xvi. of the same Epistle. There may be an allusion to 1 Cor. i. 18 in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xviii.), where it is said that "the cross of Christ is a stumbling-block to unbelievers, but salvation and eternal life to you." In the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. i.) the Greek reads, "that I may be a disciple of him who offered himself for us to God as an offering and a sacrifice," in which there appears to be a quotation of Eph. v. 2; but the Syriac has only "a disciple of God." On the other hand, in the exhortation (Polyc. v.), "Love your wives as the Lord the church," there is a reminiscence, if not a quotation, of Ephes. v. 25. It may be observed generally that, though the express quotations from the Epistles be few in the genuine Epistles of Ignatius, the style and turn of phrase indicates familiarity with them. But there is no unambiguous example of a quotation from the Evangelists or the Acts. In the conclusion of the Epistle to the Ephesians, "the virginity of Mary and the birth of our Lord escaped the knowledge of the Ruler of this world," there is evidently an allusion to the history in Matthew i. and ii., but it can hardly be called a quotation; and it is difficult to know to what the author refers in the context, where he speaks of the "three mysteries of the spirit, which were done in the quietness of God from the star." This absence of allusion to the Gospels in Ignatius is the more remarkable, as there are numerous and express quotations from them in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, written, as Lardner supposes, the year after the martyrdom of Ignatius. It is hardly less remarkable if we assign a date some few years later. Seeing how the original Epistles of Ignatius have been interpolated by the insertion of passages from Scripture, may it not be conjectured that the Epistle of Polycarp has undergone a similar process?

2. By the discovery of the original text of Ignatius' Epistles, we have at length obtained a critical basis for the discussion of the question, What opinion did he hold respecting the nature of Christ? This was wanting while we had only the Greek. Certain passages were considered as interpolations by the orthodox, because they had an Arian aspect, and indicated an origin subsequent to that controversy; and others, because they had an Athanasian character, were deemed by Arians and Unitarians inconsistent with the state of belief in the church in the days of Ignatius. Thus Dr. Priestley, in his Reply to the Monthly Reviewer (Badcock), having adverted to the suspicious character

of these Epistles, whether in the longer or the shorter recension, says (p. 37), "If any passage in these Epistles be spurious, I should not hesitate to pronounce that which you quote to be one. Such language as 'fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God incarnate, real life in death, begotten of Mary and of God, in one respect liable to suffering and in another incapable of it,' savours of a much later age than that of Ignatius. It is nothing but controversy that teaches such definite and guarded language as this." Had Dr. Priestley been living, he would have found in the Syriac text a full confirmation of the conclusion to which his sagacity had led him, though without critical evidence. There is hardly anything in the three genuine Epistles which bears on the Trinitarian controversy. In the close of that to the Romans, Ignatius says, "Be ye perfectly safe in the patience of Jesus Christ our God." This may be considered as an indication of the influence which the language of the fourth Gospel was beginning to acquire in the phraseology of the church. Lachmann reads *ὁ μονογένης Θεός* in John i. 18, and the reading, though very slenderly supported by MS. authority, is found in many of the Fathers. In the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians, where the shorter recension has *ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ*, and the longer, *ἐν αἵματι Χριστοῦ*, the Syriac has the equivalent of *Θεοῦ*. In the Latin, both the longer and the shorter have *Christi*. Griesbach, who in his note on Acts xx. 28, quotes Ignatius for the reading *Θεοῦ*, notices this discrepancy of the texts. Henceforth his testimony must be considered as in favour of *Θεοῦ*, so far at least as to shew that the combination was in use in his days. In the controversy between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsley respecting the opinions of the primitive church, both parties were misled by the want of an authentic text of the Epistles of Ignatius—Dr. Priestley in asserting that nothing like divinity was ascribed to Jesus Christ before Justin Martyr; Dr. Horsley in asserting, on the authority of a passage in the Epistle to the Magnesians, that Ignatius taught in perfectly unequivocal terms the eternal existence of the Word as a distinct person from the Father.* Of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Athanasian form, or in any form, there is no trace whatever.

3. We have seen that the controversy respecting the Epistles of Ignatius was much inflamed by the rivalry of the Presbyterian and Episcopal forms of church government. Though the existence of the office of *episcopus* in the primitive church could not be denied, it was equally true that St. Paul (Acts xx. 28), addressing the *presbyters* of the church of Ephesus, says that the Holy Spirit had made them *episcopoi* over the church. The same apostle, saluting the *episcopoi* and deacons of the church of Philippi (i. 1), shews that the *episcopos* and the *presbyter*

* Charge, p. 18.

were the same, as he never could have passed over so important a body as the presbyters. In the Epistle to Titus (i. 5—7), having mentioned his commission to ordain presbyters in every city, he goes on to mention the qualifications of an *episcopos* in such a way as to shew that the two words are synonymous. Presbyter was in the apostolic age the title of office; *episcopos*, the term descriptive of the chief duty attached to the office. Even when the office of *episcopos* was detached from the general body of the presbyters, a change the history of which is lost to us, he was only *primus inter pares*, the president of a body in which he had no supremacy but what the others voluntarily yielded him. But by a process so natural, that we see it repeated in every body governed by a council or committee, power gradually fell into the hands of this president, who was appointed for life, and supposed by his appointment to be endowed with an extraordinary measure of the Holy Spirit. Times of persecution, too, by placing the bishop, as visible head of the community, in the foremost rank of martyrs, gave occasion to the display of qualities which exalted the attachment of the people. Ignatius and Polycarp did not shrink from the fiery trial. The establishment of Christianity by law, and the whole course of subsequent events to the Reformation, tended to exalt the power of the bishop, to destroy the independence of the presbyters, and to convert the hierarchy into a spiritual tyranny. The interpolated Epistles of Ignatius were the stronghold of those who endeavoured to establish the claim of apostolical authority for episcopacy as it existed in after ages; their exhibition in an unadulterated state enables us to judge more justly than the advocates of either side in the Ignatian controversy. In the Epistle to Polycarp it is said, "Let those who marry, marry by the counsel of the bishop, that the marriage may be in our Lord." "Look to the bishop, that God may also look upon you." This last may seem rather high language, but it is immediately followed by another passage which explains it. "I will be instead of the souls* of those who are subject to the bishop and the presbyters and the deacons," shewing that the authority of the bishop was only co-ordinate. This is absolutely all that the genuine Epistles contain on the subject of episcopacy. It is enough, as Mr. Cureton observes, to vindicate the Syriac text from the charge of having been mutilated by a monk who was hostile to episcopal authority, but it is far from being enough to satisfy a High Churchman.

* Ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσόμενων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, διακόνοις. The old Latin version renders ἀντίψυχος by *unanimis*, as if equivalent to ἰσόψυχος, Philipp. ii. 20. Bishop Pearson, however, has shewn that it is equivalent to ἀντίλυτρον. Thus Athanasius speaks of Christ as giving his body to death, ἀντίψυχον ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας. Ignatius wishes that his death may be the means of averting death from those members of the church who submitted themselves to its lawful authorities.

The divine right of bishops rests on the same basis as the divine right of kings or constables—public utility. Order is heaven's first law; liberty the life of the Christian church; and whatever best combines these two requisites may claim to itself the sanction of a divine ordinance. Episcopacy is perhaps as well fitted to a rich and quiescent church, as presbytery to a poor and active one. Ignatius would have been surprised to hear of a church which was subject neither to bishop, presbyters nor deacons; and such a church would have been ill fitted to hold its place in the early and stormy age of Christianity. Yet even assemblages so loosely held together may have their appropriate office, as the means of cherishing the spirit of liberty when endangered by that love of dominion from which neither bishop, presbyter nor deacon is exempt.

4. The three Epistles give us less insight than we could have wished into the character of the martyr-bishop, or the condition of the church. They are earnest, but vague. There is little evidence in them of intellectual power. Ignatius would have made a feeble apologist for the gospel, though he freely gave his life as a testimony to his own convictions. His taste seems to have been corrupted by the puerilities of Asiatic rhetoric, and it is astonishing how a man on his road to martyrdom, addressing communities in such perilous circumstances, could trifle with words as he does. Thus he exhorts Polycarp "to expect Him who is above the times, Him to whom there are no times, Him who is unseen, Him who for our sakes was seen, Him who is impalpable, Him who is impassible, Him who for our sakes suffered, Him who endured everything in every form for our sakes." The artifice of stringing together words of similar construction is even more evident in the Greek than in the English. Again, the church of Rome is saluted as "worthy of God, worthy of honour, worthy of bliss, worthy of praise," with some more compounds of *ἄξιος*. This is not the style of Paul or Peter or James. Indeed, the comparison of the writers of the age subsequent to that of the apostles, as Barnabas and Hermas (Clement is hardly an exception), with those of the New Testament, shews the immeasurable superiority of the immediate disciples of our Lord. It was not by the wisdom of this world that the gospel made that progress, which in the beginning of the second century had already rendered it an object of fear to the professors of the old religion. Other causes no doubt contributed, but the ardent zeal of such men as Ignatius and Polycarp, who were eager to gain the crown of martyrdom, was more efficacious than eloquence or logic. One purpose of Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans was to dissuade them from endeavouring to obtain a remission of his sentence, and he deprecates in the most earnest manner any attempt to rob him of the bliss and glory which he expected as his reward. Such a passionate desire for a painful

death finds no justification in the example of Jesus or his apostles; it may even be thought an evidence of that weakness of understanding which we have observed in Ignatius. Yet there are times when the cause of truth is better served by an unreflecting enthusiasm than by profound sagacity or intellectual power, and this was one of them. Only the blood of martyrs could be the seed of the church. K.

MR. TAYLER ON SOME OPINIONS ERRONEOUSLY IMPUTED
TO HIM.

London, April 4th, 1857.

MY DEAR SIR,

I CRAVE a short space in your pages to correct some misapprehensions relating to myself. I have reason to know that it has been recently asserted in public, that I am an anti-supernaturalist. I should not think of troubling others with my private opinions on this or on any other subject, were it not that my filling a public situation seems to require of me a more explicit declaration of my sentiments than would otherwise be necessary or even becoming. If I were an anti-supernaturalist, I should certainly not hesitate to say so. But the question is one of fact; and the assertion alluded to is contrary to fact. What I believe and what I am accustomed to teach, cannot, I think, be more satisfactorily shewn, than by giving a short extract from the introductory part of my Ecclesiastical History Course, on the Life of Christ. The following passage was written within the last twelve months, solely for the use of my pupils, without the slightest expectation of its ever appearing before the general public in such a connection as the present.

“There are three modes of dealing with this mysterious element (the *supernatural* or *miraculous*) in the gospel narrative. It may be accepted literally just as it occurs in the text, which is the traditional, *orthodox* interpretation; or it may be explained away into the simply natural, which is the *rationalistic* (and of these two modes of interpretation, there cannot be a doubt that in the great majority of passages, if not in all, the former most faithfully expresses the original meaning of the writers); or, thirdly, it may be regarded as an effect of the working of the mind on itself, either converting its own ideas into objective forms, which is the essence of the proper *myth*, or investing outward objects with the form and colour of its own internal feeling and belief, which is the character of the *legend*; and this may be described in general as the *mythic* mode of interpretation, although it is not strictly a case of interpretation in its grammatical sense

or simple *exegesis* (for in the grammatical part of the process, the first and the third modes go together), but rather of the philosophical conception of the results yielded by exegesis. Of the rationalistic mode of interpretation, in nearly all the cases to which it has been applied, we may say, that it is simply absurd and impracticable. Something supernatural was plainly intended by the original writer, which his modern commentator is determined at all hazards, often in complete defiance of grammar and common sense, to convert into the natural. There are portions of the gospel narrative (the Temptation is an example) which admit of the mythic interpretation; but it plainly cannot be applied to the greater part of the public ministry of Christ. I have never yet seen any critical process, whether rationalistic or mythic, which could wholly eliminate the supernatural element from Christ's history, and leave a particle of firm and consistent texture behind. After every possible concession to a reasonable criticism, there still remains something wonderful and inexplicable adhering to the primitive fact, which leaves Christ even in his influence on the material world something more than an ordinary man. We must, therefore, take the supernatural as we find it—constituting an element in the original history which throughout the general tenor of Christ's public life it is impossible critically to get rid of, and which, when we consider the exalted aim and effect of the mission of Christ, we must suppose to have existed there for some wise and benevolent purpose.* This is the conclusion in which many of the freest and most learned inquirers, after years of earnest thought, have determined to rest, as most suitable to our present state of knowledge on the subject. In this question much depends on the religious philosophy which we put under our scriptural exegesis. If we believe that a living God is in all things, acting, never indeed capriciously or lawlessly, but still, as the great moral Heart of the universe, with a constant reference to the spiritual wants, capacities and deserts of his human children,—if we recognize the possibility of the fact, that a spiritual world with its secret and invisible agencies may be around us in every place and at every moment of our existence,—some of the difficulties which haunt speculative minds may be diminished, if not entirely removed. Particular miracles must be judged by the evidence, internal and external, accompanying them; but of the miraculous in general the foregoing considerations suffice, I think, to shew, that no impossibility, philosophical or historical, necessarily attaches to it. To us of the present day, the miracles are chiefly of importance, for the

* In another Course, I have further expressed my view of the intention of miracles, in the following words: "Their object—as indicated in the New Testament—was evidently to excite attention and produce seriousness, under the feeling that God was immediately present with Christ. On a mind thus affected and predisposed, his words fell with greater power and were more deeply pondered."

soul of Christ himself—the moral and spiritual truth—which shines so clearly and beautifully through them, and which, far more than fruitless and scrupulous attempts to explain or account for them, it should be our great object to seize and apply.”—Such has been substantially the tenor of my teaching ever since I was connected, now some fifteen years, with Manchester New College. I appeal to my pupils to confirm what I say.

As I have my pen in my hand, I may perhaps be allowed, in further illustration of the spirit in which I am accustomed to handle these topics, to quote another passage from the same Course, written like the former without the remotest idea that it would ever appear before the public.

“I approach with a feeling allied to awe, and a deep sense of responsibility, a more minute and critical investigation of the life of Christ, than I have yet gone into with my class. I wish to conduct this investigation with perfect freedom and honesty, for only thus can we rightly serve the God of truth; yet I confess I am unable to come to the subject with the absolute indifference with which I should proceed to examine any ordinary fact. I cannot divest myself, if I would, of the solemn religious associations which invest it; and perhaps I should not be better qualified for truthful inquiry if I could entirely dispel them; for these associations result inevitably from the very nature and working of the great fact before us, and are elements of thought which must enter into any adequate interpretation of it. The right conception of every fact depends on the point of view from which it is surveyed. If it be a religious fact, it must be approached in a religious spirit. Nor is this to assume beforehand what has yet to be proved. The life of Christ is the source of Christian history, and of the most powerful of the spiritual influences under which we ourselves now live. Only when we have in some degree familiarized our minds with the fact, past and present, of Christianity—only after we have noticed what its genuine influence has wrought, and is still working, for the redemption of our human world from its greatest evils—are we at all able to appreciate the magnitude and significance of the personal agency which sent it forth on its mission through the ages; and to ignore this wonderful tissue of effects, under the idea of investigating its cause more impartially as it exists in and by itself, would be like attempting a theory of the sun, viewed simply as an insulated circle of light in the heavens, to the exclusion of all consideration of its vivifying influences on our earth, and of those subtle and far-reaching attractions which bind together the whole planetary system in uniform and enduring harmony. We must therefore contemplate the life of Christ in the light that is thrown back on it by Christian history; and to shut out that light would be approaching the subject not with unbiassed, but with defective, intelligence.”

On another subject I have reason to think, from what I hear, that I am much misunderstood. I am supposed by some to be unfriendly to thorough biblical learning. In a Course, intended to call the attention of students to Christianity as a great *present* fact in the world, I wrote some years ago as follows, in a passage constantly read to my class, expressly to warn them against any neglect or undervaluing of its primitive records: "Let it, however, be distinctly understood, that criticism and exegesis, accompanied by an exact knowledge of the ancient languages, must still form the basis of a true theological education. Nothing can atone for the want of this. Without it, all our writing and preaching must be superficial, and will not endure; like a tree which for a time seems green and flourishing, but whose root is withered and dead. There is great danger in this age of our grasping too rapidly at results, without the needful and legitimate preliminaries. In the Scriptures must be sought the source of the religion, which still vitally actuates a large portion of the civilized world."

My old friend, Mr. S. Greg, in your last number, seems, on the contrary, to imagine that I attach too much importance to human learning. I can assure him that in Religion I value learning solely as a means to an end. But in a historical religion we cannot dispense with history and philology, as implements by which to work down our way to the universal and imperishable truths which are imbedded in Scripture, and to bring them out into the clear and open light of day. If I may be pardoned one more extract from myself (I only wish to be fairly judged), I would cite a passage from the conclusion of my little book on "The Religious Life of England," first published twelve years ago. What I thought then, I think, and even more strongly, now. "Learning must often be employed to undo its own work; to help a preacher to separate the living spirit of the Divine Word, from the incrustations which a misplaced erudition has gathered round it. What he should chiefly seek as the proper aim of his studies, is the power of throwing himself back into the spirit of the holy men whose mind and life are reflected in the sacred books. Having once possessed himself of this, he must forget, when he addresses his contemporaries, all that is antique in the thought or inappropriate in the phraseology of the text through which he imbibed it, and try to speak, under the sole consciousness of present, living interests, just as Paul or John would now speak, if from our point of view they were looking out, with their own deep heart of faith and warm impulse of human sympathies, on the still enduring strife of men with doubt and sin and woe. That theology has been so generally brought into the pulpit, rather than religion, is probably one reason why most churches have lost their hold on the popular feeling. The masses are more attracted by the earnest

fanaticism which comes under however rough and unshapely an exterior from the genuine heart of man, than by the cold light which streams from the polished intellect, and plays with a graceful indifference round the ingenious theories of learning and philosophy. Nevertheless, it is in the highest degree undesirable that the popular religion should be left to the direction of ignorant and vulgar minds. The mental food which has been prepared by the highest intelligence of the time, will ever be found the most palatable and the most nutritious for the masses. Refined and elevated influences, when mingled with Christian simplicity and real benevolence, are the most certain of a cordial welcome and a beneficial effect even with those who are themselves simple and uncultivated." (2nd edit., pp. 322-3.)

One other remark before I conclude. Whatever comes from the pen of my valued friend Mr. Long, especially on a subject so solemnly interesting as the resurrection of Christ, will be read by me, I need hardly assure him, with the deepest respect and attention. I only hope he will not delay his communication, that I may have time maturely to consider it, before the long vacation takes me away possibly into other scenes and engages my thoughts with other objects. I am as open, I trust, as ever to any new or completer views of the truth. It is painful to find myself opposed at any one point of my opinions to such a man. In the mean time, it must not be supposed that my belief in the reality of Christ's resurrection from the dead, as a *historically attested fact*, is not as firm as my friend's; though I am disposed to lay the main stress of the evidence for it, not altogether on the same point where it is placed by Mr. Long. The clear and emphatic testimony of the apostle Paul in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, is, I am free to confess, the sheet-anchor of my belief on this subject.

JOHN JAMES TAYLER.

A TEACHER OF THE YOUNG.

BE very circumspect to whose tuition thou committest thy child: every good scholar is not a good master. He must be a man of invincible patience and singular observation; he must study children that will teach them well, and reason must rule him that would rule wisely; he must not take advantage of an ignorant father, nor give too much ear to an indulgent grandmother; the common good must outweigh his private gains, and his credit must outbid gratuities; he must be diligent and sober, not too familiar nor too reserved, neither amorous nor phantastick; just without fierceness, merciful without fondness: if such a one thou meet with, thou hast found a treasure which, if thou knowest how to value, is invaluable.—QUARLES.

THE SECOND DEATH.

A SOUL lay dead within the sepulchre,—
Dead, but not sleeping. It did not gently rest
 In calm, unconscious, deep oblivion,
 Reposing from the cares and toils of life;
 But still its dark and lonely vigil kept
 In its own tomb,—by its own bed of death.
 Yes, it was dead, though waking, watching still.
 Hope, fear, grief, joy, desire and love, were gone:
 No pulse of life—no glad, warm, conscious being:
 Only the sense of loneliness, and wakefulness;
 Only that wearied, watchful, tearless eye.
 O'er present, past, and future, there was shed
 A cold, pale, twilight, colourless and blank,
 Still, sombre, lifeless, where the dull, dead eye
 Wandered—wandered—seeing, searching nothing.

Into that dark and lonesome sepulchre
 There stole a beam of sunshine, a wandering ray
 From heaven, seeking to shed the blessing of its light
 Upon some sad, solitary, weeping spirit.
 It came—it shone—and did not pass away,
 But seemed to linger,—as 'twould make its home
 In that dark cell. Like silent, watchful love,
 Diffusing through the air its heavenly light,
 It made that tomb a quiet oratory,
 Where Heaven could commune with the listening soul,
 And whisper thoughts to waft it to the sky.
 Then came a Voice, gentle and sweet, breathing
 Through the still air,—the Sister of the Sunbeam,—
 And spoke in tones which, like that wandering ray,
 Whispered of life and joy, of peace and heaven:
 “Awake! arise! and live and love again!”
 So breathed the gentle Voice, and from the walls
 Of that lone sepulchre there seemed to whisper
 Echoes like answering spirits, and they said,
 “Again! again! Live, live and love again!”

Softly, sweetly, silently, that soul awoke;
 It gazed and listened—breathed and lived again.
 The past rose like a vision of delight;
 The future came to meet it in the present.
 Once more it felt, remembered, loved, hoped, prayed;
 Fountains of joy were opened in its depths,
 And God's own voice seemed speaking from above.
 No longer now it mourned its lonely lot,

For henceforth there was no more solitude
In that bright dwelling ; and that gentle Voice
And that sweet heavenly Beam were the companions
Of its new-born life, and made this earthly tomb
Like a bright mansion of the blest above.

A few short, blessed hours—bright, heavenly, fleeting :
Then came a change : the Sunbeam was departed.
Silent and suddenly as first it stole
Upon the wings of darkness, so it vanished.
It had breathed no word of greeting or of parting :—
Only '*twas gone*,—gone!—never, never more
To shed its blessed light through that lone dwelling,
Or call the watching soul from its dark vigil,
As with the dawning of eternity.
The Voice too was gone ; the music of its tones
No longer murmured round those silent walls,
And woke the grateful echoes with its sweetness.
No longer did it commune with that soul,
And open all the deep, deep wells of its being,—
Now soothing the tired spirit,—now aspiring
On seraph wings to the bright throne above.
That one brief gleam of life and joy was o'er ;
The sepulchre was now once more a tomb.

Darkness came down again upon that soul ;
Darkness!—but not death : not grateful, sweet oblivion.
Still, still it lived, though nought was left *but* life ;
Nor aught of life but consciousness to pain,—
To the remembrance of that one hour of heaven,
And the hot thirst for love and life and joy.
In the long past, Solitude had had *one* meaning ;
Now it had another. It was no longer
Dull, slow, dead, lonely watching,
Feeling, desiring, hoping, loving nothing.
Now '*twas* sharp agony ; longing—longing
For the companionship that had become
Part of its being. Now '*twas* indeed alone
In the wide universe, and *felt* it was alone.
The past threw its dim shadow o'er eternity,—
O'er those dark, fathomless, everlasting years.

Oh, Sleep ! Death ! deep Oblivion ! shed thy blessing ;
Close that strained eye, and still that throbbing heart,
And let the tortured spirit sink to rest !

E.

UNITARIANISM THE PROPER BOND OF UNION AMONG
UNITARIANS.33, *Queen Anne Street, March, 1857.*

MY DEAR SIR,

IN my last letter I endeavoured to shew that the principle recommended by Mr. Tayler as a bond of Christian union could never be applied to any particular class of Christians, because it belonged equally to all. I also contended that, as Unitarians differed with other Christians on the most important subject of the Object of religious worship, Unitarianism must from that circumstance be *a* bond of union. I now proceed to shew that it ought to be *the* bond of union in preference to any other, because it involves far more important religious doctrines and sentiments—namely, those which relate to our conceptions of the Divine character, to the responsibility of man, and to the duty of making the life of Jesus Christ the example of our own. No one can doubt that these are the most important points of Christianity to which we can direct our attention. If, then, it can be shewn, that these unspeakably important points of religion are presented to the mind, on the principles of Unitarianism, in points of view far more calculated to command the assent of the understanding, and to interest the best feelings of the heart, than on any other principles, it follows that Unitarianism is the most important distinction in the Christian world. The question which most deeply interests the human race is the character of the Great Being who made and who rules the universe, and the relation in which his human creatures stand to him. Now Trinitarianism teaches that the first Person of the Trinity could not, consistently with his attribute of justice, pardon sin, without inflicting a punishment on an innocent individual equivalent to what the sinners had deserved; and that the second Person of the Trinity (to whom this so-called attribute of justice cannot belong) offered himself to take human nature upon him, and to suffer in his own person what was equivalent to the punishment which, but for his interference, the whole human race must have endured. It seems plain that on this system the object of love in the hearts of pardoned sinners must be the second, and not the first, Person of the Trinity,—the atoning Sacrifice, and not the inexorable Judge who demanded the sacrifice. What says the Unitarian to all this? He tells you that the notion that the Deity cannot, consistently with his perfections, pardon sinners on repentance, is wholly without foundation in any rational or moral conception which we can form of God; and that it is directly in contradiction to the whole tenor not only of the New, but also of the Old Testament. The Unitarian holds that the Great Father of the human race so loved the world, that he sent his beloved Son, that whosoever

believed in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. He looks up to the Great God as his kind and forgiving Father, and to his Son Jesus Christ, whom he sent into the world to seek and to save that which was lost, to live a life of perfect piety and virtue, and to suffer and to die for the salvation of sinful man. Such is the Unitarian view of the doctrine of Christian redemption, which beautifully harmonizes with all that our rational and our moral faculties suggest as to the character of the Deity, to which this mis-called Orthodox system is directly opposed.

Let us next consider the responsibility of man, according to these two systems. If we may take the 9th Article of the Church of England as the exponent of the doctrine of original sin,—and I believe it is quite consistent with explanations of that doctrine given by other orthodox churches and sects,—“it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam;” and in a subsequent part of the Article, it is said, that “in every person born into this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.” Now this doctrine, so revolting to our reason and our moral faculty, and so inconsistent with our ideas of justice, is rejected by the Unitarian, who holds that men are answerable for their own offences only, and not at all for those of a progenitor who died ages before they were born. If, then, there were no other distinctions between the Unitarians and the rest of the Christian world, their differences on these most important doctrines would fully justify and, to my apprehension, imperiously call on the Unitarians to separate themselves from the great body of Christians, and to set up a church of their own; and until more important grounds of distinction can be found, that church will be properly called Unitarian.

I know of none, nor can I conceive any subjects of equal importance in religion with those which we have just been considering; but another remains which is particularly connected with the subject now in discussion in your pages, and which is of the deepest concern to every serious Christian. All churches and sects agree that Jesus Christ is not only our Redeemer, but also our Example. But the importance of an example must depend on our ability to follow it. It would be absurd to recommend the example of a man remarkable for taste and discrimination of colours to a blind man, or of one particularly skilful in melody and harmony to a deaf man. But is there not an approach to these absurdities in the exhortations of the orthodox to Christians to make Jesus Christ their example? On their system, he is God-man, the Deity so united to a human being as to be one person. How, it may well be asked, can such a Being be an example to ordinary men? If we can overcome the extreme difficulty of forming a conception of such a Being,

it seems impossible to imagine for a moment that the temptations by which men are assailed and seduced to evil could have the slightest force or influence on Him. Deity, according to any conception which we are capable of forming on the subject, must absorb and swallow up humanity. Will any one be hardy enough to assert that God can be tempted to evil? But if we admit that he cannot, how can we recognize a resemblance between him who was both God and man and ourselves, who have nothing beyond our human nature? I cannot perceive how a God-man can be an example to a mere human being. But it may be objected to me that I have already, in opposition to Mr. Tayler's views, said, that to follow the example of Jesus is admitted to be a duty by all Christians. This is true, and is to be explained in this way. The distinction between God and Christ so clearly pervades the whole of the New Testament, that all perceive and adopt it in fact, however inconsistent it may be with their professed creed. I suspect that the Trinitarian is apt to leave the doctrine of the Trinity at the church door, and only to resume it when Trinitarian forms of worship are to be adopted. Certain it is that, in a very large portion of the writings of Trinitarians, Jesus Christ is mentioned and distinguished from God much in the same way as he is by Unitarians. This happy inconsistency enables Trinitarians to apply the example of Jesus to themselves in the same way as Unitarians; but still it is an inconsistency. I think, then, that Mr. Tayler's principle of making the character of Christ the type and bond of union among Christians, though applicable to all churches and sects, involves some degree of inconsistency in all except Unitarians, and therefore should the more strongly attach him to Unitarianism. If, then, the most important distinctions of the religious connexion to which Mr. Tayler belongs are properly expressed by the word Unitarian, it appears to follow that it is the most proper designation to be given to that section of the Christian church.

Let us now attend to Mr. Tayler's objections to the use of the term Unitarianism. Hard words are cast upon it. It is the narrowest form of Unitarian dogmatism; it is sharply defined; it has a vagueness of denomination; it is too narrow and too negative; an inadequate and one-sided expression of the great object of Christian union. Of these charges, the first is to me unintelligible, the second honourable, and the justness of all the others I deny. Guessing as well as I can the meaning of the first charge, it seems to amount to this—the Unitarians are strongly attached to the dogmas which they profess to believe. If this be the real meaning of the passage, I sincerely hope that the charge is well founded, and that the time never will arrive when Unitarians will cease to feel and to express the warmest interest in those opinions by which they are distinguished from

the rest of the Christian world. The charge of being "sharply defined" means, I presume, "clearly expressed," which to any but philosophical writers of a certain class must be considered to deserve praise rather than censure. How it can be sharply defined, and yet have a vagueness of denomination, I confess I cannot understand. When Mr. Tayler tells us that it is too narrow and too negative, he should have shewn what important doctrines it excludes which would give it greater breadth; and he should have explained how its doctrines respecting the paternal character of God, the person of Christ, and the redemption by him, are merely negative; or that if they be allowed to be positive, there are other matters which Unitarians content themselves with denying, but respecting which they are bound to make affirmations. That Unitarianism is an inadequate and one-sided expression of Christian union, is an assertion of which no proof has been given, or, I believe, can be given. None of these statements seem to me to shew, or to tend to shew, that Unitarian is not the proper name to be given to the religious denomination to which Mr. Tayler and myself belong.

The only plausible objection to those congregations who embrace Unitarian opinions calling themselves by that name is, that it is supposed to interfere with and limit the right of free inquiry. There is, however, really no weight in this objection. The Unitarians have never assumed a right to dictate to others in matters of faith. They had for a long period to strive for legal protection, which at length they obtained. At present they have only to say to other Christians, We do not wish to interfere in your religious concerns, but our consciences require that we should unite in congregations where the Almighty is worshiped in such a form as the Scriptures appear to us to dictate, and that all worship unauthorized by the Bible should be excluded from our congregations. But this, it will be said, is setting up a creed. No doubt it is; and every society of Christians must have something in which they agree and which is their bond of union—in other words, their creed. The mischief lies not in having a creed, but in attempting to force that creed on others. I would have all who are Unitarians profess to be so; but let those who choose to join their congregations be admitted without question. So far am I from wishing to exclude Trinitarians and unbelievers from attending our congregations, that I think it for the interest of Unitarianism that, if so disposed, they should do so. It seems impossible, for instance, that a serious, religious and reflecting member of the Church of England could attend the worship of Essex-Street chapel without asking himself the question, Which is most conformable to the Scriptures, the Liturgy in its ancient form used in the Established Church, or in its reformed shape in Essex Street? No Unitarian will doubt that the answer of such a person will probably be in favour of the reformed Liturgy;

although in some cases early and long-continued associations may attach an individual to his accustomed forms with a force which the strongest arguments cannot resist. It is, however, unlikely that Trinitarians should attend Unitarian worship; but that many unbelievers may and do so is undeniable. What, then, will be the probable consequence? A conscientious Deist can hardly fail to think and to feel that some communication should be kept up between man and his Maker. That in the most important of all his relations, the human being should pass his life with no intercourse with the Great Being who made him, and in whose hands is his future destiny, beyond an acknowledgment of his existence and attributes, surely cannot be deemed satisfactory by moral and rational men. Religion is a natural want of the human race; and whatever be our negligence in ordinary occasions, in seasons of trouble and affliction we fly to our Creator for protection, consolation and support. Strangely must the mind of that man be constituted who spends his days without prayer, without thanksgiving, without praise addressed to the Author of his being, the Bestower of all he has enjoyed or ever can enjoy. I cannot suppose that any conscientious Deist lives without sometimes expressing devotional feelings to God. But if this be his practice, and he esteem it of importance, it is but a short step to admit the propriety and utility of public worship. But here arises a great difficulty. Natural religion has never been able for any considerable time to support places of worship. An attempt of that kind was made in London in 1776 by David Williams, but it failed. The Theophilanthropists in France, at the time of the great Revolution, also established Deistical worship; but it continued only for a short time. In becoming acquainted with the doctrines of the Unitarians, a Deist will find many of his objections to the Christian religion removed; he will see much which he can hardly fail to approve; he will probably be led to investigate the evidence of the truth of Christianity with a far more impartial spirit than if he had merely been acquainted with it in what is called its orthodox form; and we may fairly hope that there is much probability of his recognizing, in the end, its truth and unspeakable importance.

But if we are to drop the name Unitarian, what designation are we to adopt? Surely some word must be in use to distinguish us from the rest of the Christian world, with whom we widely differ. Mr. Tayler, with great hesitation, seems to prefer Protestant Dissenter; and Mr. Solly would substitute Christian Disciples. Neither of these denominations expresses those peculiarities by which we are distinguished from other Christians. Both these writers agree that there must be some definite positive belief. If this be true (and who will deny it?), we must admit the propriety, and indeed the necessity, of some word to express that belief. I have shewn the positive character of Uni-

tarianism as it is commonly understood, and no other name has been suggested expressing the belief and opinions of those to whom it is applied.

I have now occupied as much of your space as it seems expedient to fill in one communication, and I must defer what remains of the subject to a future occasion.

GEORGE LONG.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE REV. WILLIAM MANNING AND HIS OPINIONS.

THE REV. WILLIAM MANNING was one of those sanguine divines of the Established Church who in the last century were so desirous "of setting religious establishments upon the most extensive foundation of which Christianity is capable." He himself went so far as to wish "that the use of all creeds should be laid aside in forms of public devotion," holding that "Revelation stands upon matter of *fact*, and that mere *opinions* of themselves avail nothing to the operation of it upon the hearts of mankind." These extracts, taken from the Preface, will serve to illustrate the pervading spirit of his small volume of Sermons.* With what righteous horror would the following very remarkable passage from the second Sermon be now received in certain quarters of the Establishment! "Differences of opinion," says he, "may innocently exist among us, and ought not to be the cause of a disunion in Christian charity, *much less, if we dare to make the distinction, in Christian communion.* Were no more required by establishments as terms of communion than Christ and his apostles required in order to admit mankind to be partakers of the gospel dispensation, the violent disputes of Christians would soon sink into harmless discussions, the objections of unbelievers would be more satisfactorily answered, and the ardency of enthusiasm would be cooled and assuaged by reason and argument." The Three Sermons themselves are uniformly distinguished by the greatest liberality and vigour of thought, conveyed in a masculine diction; but it is to the illustrative Notes, where Mr. Manning's *heterodox* views on the Trinity and the Atonement more especially appear in full, and supported by no little learning and ability, that we principally draw attention. We will first introduce the very few facts at hand relative to this eminently liberal-minded man.

The Rev. William Manning, author of the Three Sermons,

* Three Sermons preached at the Norfolk Assizes in 1788, 1789; illustrated with Notes. By the Rev. William Manning, Rector of Diss and Brome, in Norfolk. London. 1790.

appears to have succeeded to the rectory of Diss in 1778, which, in consequence of its being a family living, descended to his son, and has within the last few months come into the possession of his grandson. It is remarkable that for eighty years the rectory remained in the hands of the father and son, the elder Mr. Manning having held it for thirty-four years, the younger for forty-six years. Of the son, lately deceased, it is interesting to know that, although as rector of Diss he only lived a very quiet and retired life, in earlier years he had held the tutorship of Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, and while in that position numbered among his pupils the ex-Bishop of London. If the son's opinions were as liberal and his learning as great as his father's, he appears to have been too temperate publicly to avow the one, and too modest to display the other. It may be that the father lived in times more favourable to free inquiry and free expression than fell to the son's lot; at any rate, the volume before us contains a most fearless avowal of sentiments, the very antipodes of commonly-understood *orthodox* opinions. It might be very well made a text-book of the more advanced views of modern Unitarianism. The author was indeed on friendly terms with many eminent Unitarians of his day, and the remembrance is still fondly kept up by members of the Diss congregation of his having been always forward to greet ministers of our body when they visited the town on occasions of particular interest. His very sanguine hope that at no very distant day the Established Church would throw wide open its doors, and thus be "the first to give an illustrious example of religious toleration," was doubtless what principally permitted him conscientiously to enjoy the benefit of his very valuable livings.

In the very wide-spread attempt which was made about twenty years prior to the publication of his volume, for the purpose of bringing about a reform from within in the Church of England, Mr. Manning, we believe, took a very active and prominent part. It appears that there were two parties at the time,—one desiring subscription to Articles to be altogether abolished; the other seeking, after the examples of Tillotson, Patrick, Stillingfleet, &c., merely to *alter* the Liturgy and Articles, and still to require subscription as before. The fashionable idea favoured the adoption of the latter, that is, the Arian or Clarkean opinion; but our author was himself of opinion that "a mere critical alteration in *words* and expressions, without giving a latitude and free scope to *opinions*, would have been no more than the *pageantry* of an alteration, without the reality of it." Although petitions and proposals on both sides were presented to the House of Commons, and gave rise to a very important and interesting debate, nothing tangible resulted from the movement. Mr. Manning sums up his own views on this subject at the end of his Notes as follows:

"Let all creeds be dismissed from our public form of worship, as unnecessary to those who assemble together for the purpose of divine worship with an avowed faith in Jesus Christ; of which faith it ought to be deemed a sufficient evidence that they join in prayers and praises which are offered up to Almighty God in his name. Let the object of worship be expressed in those terms *only* which Christ and his apostles authorized by their precepts and directions. This would bring us back to the primitive simplicity of addressing prayers for all blessings spiritual and temporal, and ascribing all glory, adoration and praise, *solely* to the God and Father of all, through Jesus Christ our Lord; leaving those who apprehend a distinction in the unity of the Deity to the unrestrained operation of the pious conceptions of their minds in their devotions. And that they may not be in the least embarrassed, let no subscription be required to the form of prayer. It would be needless then to revise the Articles. Let them gently sink into oblivion; or rather, as Dr. Gregory has said they will, let them 'long remain a monument of the extent and weakness of the human understanding;' we have only to forbear to require subscription to them."

We now proceed to quote his remarks (as contained in the illustrative Notes) on the Trinity and Atonement.

In the second Sermon, speaking of the great purport of the Christian faith, he says, "The minds of those who were sent to convert the world to our holy religion, were left liable to the opinions and prejudices of the times and countries in which they lived;" and it is as illustrative of this remark that he is led to expatiate at some length on the doctrine of the Trinity. This doctrine he thinks "not so peculiar to the Christian revelation as to be incapable of having been derived from that fertile source, the invention and imagination of man." He then traces it to Plato, whom he supposes to have derived the germ of the idea originally from either the books of Moses, or else from conversation with some Jewish rabbi.

"From whichever of these two sources," he says, "Plato acquired his ideas, it may be allowed that the seeds of the doctrine of the Trinity, that is, hints which would serve for a foundation whereon that doctrine might be built, were sown by Plato among his followers. During the time of Pagan darkness, these seeds lay in a great measure dormant. But when the leaven of the gospel caused a fermentation among religious opinions, every one of an assimilating nature endeavoured, as it were, to incorporate with it. At that period arose Philo the Jew, of a soul so congenial with Plato, that it was said of him, 'Either Philo platonizes, or Plato philonizes.' This man being contemporary with our Saviour, while the apostles were preaching the gospel, he propagated Platonic Judaism throughout Asia. Let it be observed also that the most learned among the early converts were educated in the schools of the Platonists."

Mr. Manning then goes on to speak of St. John's Gospel, the Proem of which especially he thinks to have obviously originated in Platonic notions; and the whole narrative itself he is very reluctant to ascribe to John, excepting in so far as "the principal facts and anecdotes" are concerned. The peculiar way in which

the writer speaks of the *Jews*, as though they were foreigners to him, causes our author to suspect that the Gospel "was not written by one who had been a Jew."

"But whatever mistakes," he adds, "there may be in these surmises with regard to the writer of this Gospel, and supposing it granted that it was written by St. John, yet there are strong marks to support the opinion that the Gospel was written very late in the first century, when the philosophy of Plato was, by means of Philo, favourably received in Asia; which may lead us to conceive that his mind was biassed by it. It is the only Gospel in which the terms *Ζωή*, *Λόγος*, *Μονογενής*, which, it is well known, were much in vogue amongst the Platonists, are applied as they are there applied. It is undoubtedly highly reasonable that we pay great deference to a sacred historian; but how can we help surmising that he has christianized the Philonic Platonism which then prevailed? And under the persuasion that this is *possible*, ought we not to be exceedingly cautious how we perplex the Christian world with a doctrine deduced from it, as an article of faith? What the writer's ideas were, when he used these terms, will be difficult for us to ascertain at this distant period. If we conceive that he meant to convey the notion of different modes of existence (which have been since called persons) in the incomprehensible Creator of all things; yet, since he is singular in using these expressions, since they are of so vague a nature, and since we have no proof that this writer had a particular revelation in this matter, or that he was more fully instructed in his office than the other evangelists, it seems to be a faith of that nature which a man ought to have to himself. And then surely he ought not dogmatically to obtrude it upon others, or refuse them the right hand of fellowship for not holding it; nor ought he to be solicitous that the expressions of it, or indeed any allusions to it, should continue to be inserted in the public forms of devotion, to the great embarrassment of many faithful and thinking Christians. . . . It is much to be wished that all parties were allowed to enjoy their respective opinions of this matter in tranquillity and with *credit*; for the utmost latitude of sentiment on this subject is perfectly compatible with the profession, the privileges, and the hopes of Christianity. The positive decision of a question so abstruse and disputable ought by no means to be assumed as the criterion of orthodoxy and made essential to salvation, but should be left open to free inquiry and amicable discussion.

"And this end may perhaps be promoted by a few observations upon another passage of Scripture; and that is the form of baptizing recorded in Matthew xxviii. 19. St. Matthew's Gospel was written in Hebrew, and never came down to us in the original, which was soon lost; probably from this circumstance, that the Greek language was then well understood among the Jews and Jewish converts. And may we not fairly suppose the translator to have imbibed Philonic Platonism? This will incline us to think that he might add part at least of that verse. How else can we account for its not being mentioned by any other of the New-Testament writers? How else can we account for no notice being taken of that form in the several anecdotes of baptizing converts recorded in the Acts of the Apostles? It might possibly be originally a marginal note, and afterwards be inserted in the text, in all the copies

which came down to us, or of which we have had any translations. The language favours of a later period than the date of St. Matthew's Gospel, and betrays a mode of expression that does not appear to have been used before the second century. If I might presume to offer a conjecture, it would be this,—that I conceive it to have been inserted between the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. For it is not quoted by the former in any of his writings; and in his circumstantial accounts of baptism, it should seem that it would have been much to his purpose; and this writer in citing quotations from the Gospels (or *memoirs* as he called them) was very profuse. This also shews the *possibility* that the doctrine which has been thought peculiar to the Christian revelation, may have been derived from that fertile source, the imagination of man—from the imaginary improvements made by Plato upon the Jewish revelation.

“We have no ground for believing that the ancient Jews had any idea of this doctrine. But the Jews about our Saviour's time were acquainted with the Greek language; hence Philo had an opportunity of acquiring the philosophy of Plato and propagating it among his countrymen. From whence we may easily perceive how it obtained a place in the Jewish Targums and Talmuds, of the antiquity of which we have no satisfactory account. For who can trace them higher than to the times of Philo?

“Philo undoubtedly had his party among his countrymen; and Plato's philosophy at that period had obtained the ascendancy in the Pagan world. Many, therefore, of the most learned, both of the Jewish and Gentile converts, came into the church with preconceived opinions acquired from it. And as learning gives a superiority over the bulk of mankind, for the same cause that higher faculties place us above the irrational creatures, these opinions became prevalent; and notwithstanding the caution given by some of the apostles against attending to vain philosophy and the rudiments of the world, they baffled the opposition which history tells us was made to them in the first ages of Christianity, and caused those additions to be made to the faith which have ever since involved the Christian world in furious contentions, and robbed us of that harmony which ought to be the characteristic of Christians.

“But the progress of this doctrine was gradual; it was not till the second century that the term *Τρις* was invented; nor does it appear that prayers were offered to Christ in the first century; nor is there any command for our praying to him throughout the Scriptures. And it is indisputably clear that the Holy Spirit was not addressed as a distinct person in the Deity till after the Nicene Council. And it begins to be a general opinion that the famous passage in the First Epistle of St. John, chap. v. 7, was inserted after that æra; for it is not quoted by the Nicene Fathers in the controversy of Arius, nor can it be clearly proved that it was ever cited by any who preceded them. Thus by ascribing to their proper source these metaphysical ideas, instead of submitting to them as religious truths, we may be enabled to avoid the awkward dilemma in which the ingenious author of the symbol called the Athanasian Creed was involved, who tells us to this purpose, and almost in these words, viz., ‘We are by the Christian verity compelled to acknowledge that, which by the Catholic religion we are forbidden

to say.' Surely, then, these considerations should make us hold our opinions with diffidence, and be cautious how we violate the natural and unalienable rights of religious and intellectual liberty, which were given us by our gracious Creator, by imposing the unnecessary and grievous burden of obscure and systematical opinions, lest we excite and ferment pernicious divisions among our fellow-christians, and instead of serving the cause of the gospel (which it is to be hoped we sincerely mean to do), may have to answer to God for the mischiefs we occasion, and for the obloquy and the reproach which we bring upon our holy profession.

"Though we are greatly indebted to the writers of the New Testament, we should consider that the apostles were sent to *preach*, not to *write*. They had only to declare to the world a few plain *facts* of which they had been *witnesses*, and which were sufficient to bring mankind to a knowledge of God and his providence, and to an assurance of a remission of their sins upon their repentance and turning from their iniquities, and to the lively hope of the resurrection from the dead."

The remark, "that the apostles were sent to *preach*, not to *write*," is exceedingly good; and were it only borne in mind in all critical examination of the New-Testament writings, far less stress would be laid upon detached passages, particular texts, now so commonly but no less unhappily the practice, than upon an understanding of the writer's *general* argument. The free admissions made by Mr. Manning with regard to Matt. xxviii. 19 and 1 John v. 7, are the highest possible testimony to the noble catholicity of his mind,—a quality far more desirable than apparent at the present day. If the above remarks on these spurious passages could be only circulated to the extent they deserve, they could hardly fail of influencing unprejudiced minds strongly in favour of a revision of the Bible.

Mr. Manning's note on "Christ Crucified" is scarcely less interesting than his note on the Trinity. We subjoin his very rational remarks on the subject of the "Atonement;" hoping, however, that his little volume of Sermons may not be found quite so scarce as the so-called *orthodox* opponents of a Jowett and a Robertson would wish to be the case.

"Whether the sacrifice of the death of Christ is, or is not, to be considered as a vicarious atonement, which he voluntarily undertook to make for the expiation of the guilt of our sins, is a question that has been much agitated, and has occasioned a great diversity of opinion. . . . God is every where in Scripture represented as the Author and Bestower of the salvation wrought by Jesus Christ, and is no where said to be reconciled to *us*, but *we* are said to be reconciled to *him*, by the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ. And how? Not surely in a manner analogous to that in which a charm may be supposed to operate; but by the effect and influence which a serious belief and contemplation of these events will naturally produce upon our manners and principles. Had the Jews become proselytes to our Saviour's doctrine, we may presume to conjecture that the end of our Saviour's mission would probably have been answered *without* his death and sufferings. . . . Whoever still thinks that any expression of St. Peter, St. Paul, or any other

apostle, even after all due allowance made for the Eastern mode of expression, conveys to him the idea of vicarious atonement,—he may consider that as they were liable to be influenced by impressions of education, they were also liable to mistakes arising from them. The mind of St. Peter, though honest, was so much warped by Jewish prejudices and rabbinical fables, that he stood in need of particular visions and revelations to enable him to proceed in the execution of his apostolic commission. And a rabbinical tale seems to have been uppermost in his mind, when, speaking of our being redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, he says, ‘Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world; but was manifested in these last times for you’ (1 Peter i. 20). The tale is this: ‘When God created the world, he held forth his hand under the throne of glory and created the soul of the *Messiah* and his company, and said to him, Wilt thou heal and redeem my sons, after six thousand years? He answered, Yes. God said to him, If so, wilt thou bear chastisements to expiate their iniquity, according to what is written, Isaiah liii. 4, *Surely he bore our griefs*? He answered, I will endure them with joy.’ And St. Paul, whose predestinarian ideas are probably derived from Jewish prejudices, the seeds of which were perhaps sown in the Chaldean captivity, is supposed to refer to the same in his Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. i. 4. His intention seems to have been to compromise matters between Jewish and Gentile converts,—that whereas the first boasted themselves then elected, the latter might think themselves also elected with them.

“St. Paul seems to have been very fond of using the *argumentum ad hominem* in addressing the Jews, who might probably object to Christianity as destitute of sacrifices and ritual observances; and it was natural for him to reply, Can you have faith in the blood of bulls and goats, that they sanctify to the purifying of the faith? How much more shall the blood of Christ purify your consciences from dead works to serve the living God! Here we may again observe that the effect which the death and sufferings of Christ are said to work, is upon *us*, and not upon *God*. We have as firm a reliance under this idea upon the promises of God declared by our Lord Jesus Christ, as under the metaphysical idea that an atonement was made to the justice of God to enable his mercy to operate. Each party may have their particular faith to themselves, and give the right hand of fellowship to the other. But when metaphysical disquisitions are made to pass for religious truths, unbounded is the mischief of which they are productive; and this, alas! has unhappily been the case from the first century through several ages, perhaps to the present period of the Christian æra. Nor will the idea I have suggested reduce Christianity to a mere moral system; for it teaches piety as well as morality.

“It is undoubtedly one great end of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, that as the Captain of our salvation was made perfect by sufferings, and passed through them into his joy, so it is our duty to follow his example of patience, obedience and resignation to the will of God, and to pass through the evils that may any time befall us in this life, more especially those which are brought upon us by the discharge of our duty, with confidence or faith of obtaining the rewards of bliss and glory which God has promised in the life to come. Hence we see one great advantage arising from our complying with our Lord’s institution of eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of his death.

“ This notion of mine of the original *contingency* of the death of Christ, I am very sensible may give offence to many whose disapprobation I shall be unwilling to incur. Nor am I so partially fond of it myself as to go great lengths in its vindication. If Christ had not fallen by the hands of the Jews, he would probably have been sacrificed to the political jealousy of the Romans; and his death might have been predetermined, whilst the desolation and destruction of the Jews remained contingent. If it were necessary that he should be destroyed, it does not appear to have been necessary that he should have been destroyed by the Jews. And though his death and passion might have been pre-ordained, it does not follow that he was apprized of the destiny that awaited him, till he was likewise apprized of the final impenitence of his countrymen. At what time the foreknowledge of these events was communicated to him, cannot be ascertained with any precision. It was probably communicated gradually, and might not be complete till about the time that the vision of Moses and Elias was presented to him at his transfiguration. His appointment to the office of the Messiah would not of itself conduct him to a foresight of his death and sufferings. For these humiliating ideas were never annexed by the Jews to the character and expectation of their Messiah. See St. John xii. 34.”

To these particulars of the opinions and life of Mr. Manning, we think it expedient to append the account of his son which appears in the Gentleman's Magazine for March.

Jan. 3. The Rev. WILLIAM MANNING, Rector of Diss and Weeting, in the county of Norfolk, aged 85.

Mr. Manning was born at Broome, in Norfolk, on the 30th of September, 1771. His father, who was rector of that parish, and of Diss also, came to reside at the latter place in 1778, and there the subject of our present notice spent the greater part of his long, useful, and blameless life. He was educated at King Edward's Grammar School in Bury St. Edmunds, and at Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, and distinguished himself at both, ranking high among Dr. Becker's pupils at school, and proceeding ninth Wrangler at the mathematical tripos in 1793. Cambridge offered in these days little encouragement to classical pursuits; but Mr. Manning always cherished the studies of his youth, and to the last referred with zest to his favourite authors, Horace and Cicero. He became Fellow and tutor of his college, where among his private pupils he numbered the ex-Bishop of London, and was among the earliest to recognise his distinguished abilities; for the late Lord Liverpool having applied to Mr. Manning to find him a tutor for his son, he strongly recommended Mr. Charles James Blomfield, of Trinity College; and this appointment, supported as it was by his lordship's great learning and merits, may be regarded as his first step in the road to high preferment.

In 1804 Mr. Manning was presented by the Master and Fellows of Caius College to the Rectory of Weeting, which he held until the time of his death, and in 1811 he succeeded his father in the Rectory of Diss, completing on the day of his decease the forty-sixth year of his incumbency. In this town he resided nearly half-a-century,—the friend, benefactor, and pastor of two generations of its inhabitants.

Of the universal respect and esteem in which Mr. Manning was held

by the people among whom he dwelt so long, the town and its neighbourhood afforded a signal instance on the day of his funeral. It was observed as a day of public mourning: all business was suspended, every shop was closed, and hundreds attended their revered friend to his last earthly resting-place. For he was one of whom it might be truly said, that "when the ear heard him, it blessed him; and when the eye saw him, it gave witness to him."

From the retirement in which Mr. Manning lived, especially in his later years, his rare qualities of heart and mind were known to comparatively few beyond the circle of his immediate friends. Within that circle, "the daily beauty of his life" was clearly felt and actively impressive. No man's judgment was sounder in temporal or spiritual matters; his charity, though often secretly bestowed, was large and unflinching; he loved his own Church, but was tolerant of dissent from her, and he had no delight in narrowing her ways or restricting her privileges. Those who heard him in the pulpit can testify to the weight and impressiveness of his preaching, and those who administered public business with him can speak to the patience and sagacity with which he sifted evidence and applied the law. His taste in literature was highly cultivated; the amount of knowledge he possessed was unsuspected by those whose acquaintance with him was casual, for it was too often concealed by his innate modesty of nature. Both from books and society, however, he had, in a long life, stored up a fund of practical and speculative wisdom, which rendered his conversation instructive and interesting in the highest degree. His gracious manners made him a welcome companion in all societies, but perhaps he was never more attractive than when he unbent himself with the young, the poor, and the uninstructed.

Mr. Manning married, in 1812, Elizabeth, daughter and co-heiress of the Rev. William Sayers Donne, Rector of Colton, in Norfolk, by whom he leaves two sons and four daughters. The name of his second brother, Thomas Manning, is familiar to all who have read Charles Lamb's correspondence, and is still held in honour by the few who are able to appreciate his extensive and intimate acquaintance with the manners and languages of the East. Neither of these highly gifted brothers has, unfortunately for the world, left any permanent record in print of his learning and abilities.

W. B.

* * * This appears to be a not unsuitable occasion for mentioning our recent acquisition by purchase of three interesting theological works, distinctively Unitarian in their character, in the autograph of Mr. William Manning, the ejected minister of Middleton-cum-Fordley, in the county of Suffolk. They were prepared for the press, but do not appear to have been printed. We hope shortly to give some account of these works, and to prefix an account of the author. Any of our correspondents having letters or literary references bearing on the life and theological opinions of William Manning, and not alluded to by Calamy, Palmer and Wallace, will confer an obligation by putting themselves at once into communication with the Editor of the *Christian Reformer*.

MRS. GASKELL'S LIFE OF CHARLOTTE BRONTË.*

THIS long-expected work will not disappoint the anticipations of Mrs. Gaskell's warmest admirers. It more than sustains the high reputation of the authoress of "*Cranford*" and "*Mary Barton*." It proves that her powers in the metaphysical analysis and portraiture of real character are at least equal to those she has displayed in the conception and description of ideal character. A generous spirit of honest but discriminating admiration pervades the whole work. It is the tribute of love and honour ungrudgingly paid by one true and noble woman to the memory of another of kindred genius. It is a work, too, which none but a woman could have written, and which few living women could have written so well. The subject presented some serious difficulties. A mere superficial observer, attracted by the prominently morbid symptoms, would have failed to comprehend the essential healthiness and true moral beauty of Miss Brontë's character. Its delineation made it necessary to tell some things affecting the living, the narrative of which required gentle handling and the nicest taste. The surviving friends of Miss Brontë are perhaps the only persons qualified to declare that no portion of this *Life* of her gives pain; but every reader of taste will feel that this is no common biography. It is not a mere stringing together of facts, dates and names; but our authoress has passed all the materials through the alembic of her own gifted mind, and the result is pure spirit, the veritable life of a very remarkable person. Without sympathy with her subject, she must have signally failed in her task, and would have given us not a true portrait that all but speaks, but a mere lifeless profile or a gross caricature. She thus describes the spirit in which she approached her work:

"The difficulty that presented itself most strongly to me, when I first had the honour of being requested to write this biography, was how I could show what a noble, true, and tender woman Charlotte Brontë really was, without mingling up with her life too much of the personal history of her nearest and most intimate friends. After much consideration of this point, I came to the resolution of writing truly, if I wrote at all; of withholding nothing, though some things, from their very nature, could not be spoken of so fully as others."—II. 273.

The interest of the story mainly centres in the early days of struggle. This is often the case in the biography of those who in achieving success have had great difficulties to overcome. We propose in the article now before us to dwell chiefly, though not exclusively, on the early life of Miss Brontë. It is in some respects a melancholy story; but the dark shadows of depression

* The *Life* of Charlotte Brontë, Author of "*Jane Eyre*," "*Shirley*," "*Villette*," &c. By E. C. Gaskell, Author of "*Mary Barton*," "*Ruth*," &c. 2 vols. London—Smith, Elder & Co. 1857.

and sorrow are relieved by some personal virtues of more than ordinary brightness, and a fidelity to duty not often surpassed. The possession of genius is sometimes the motive or apology for the neglect of the every-day duties of life. It was not so perverted by Charlotte Brontë, who was as conscientious in doing what she thought right after her name had become a celebrity, as when she was toiling in depression and obscurity for a salary not greater in amount than that received by confidential servants.

Charlotte Brontë was born, April 21, 1816, at Thornton, a desolate township in the parish of Bradford, in Yorkshire. She was the third of a family of six, of whom five were daughters, the children of the Rev. Patrick Brontë, a native of Ireland, and Maria his wife, sprung from a respectable Cornish family. Mr. Brontë was the architect of his own fortune. The outlines of his history display the independence and rough energy of his character. Being one of ten children of a humble farmer in Ahaderg, in the county of Down, and having a soul which prompted him to seek a better fate than that of an Irish cotter, he opened a school when only sixteen years of age. His savings, first as a pedagogue and next as a tutor in the family of an Irish rector, enabled Patrick Brontë to enter himself, when twenty-five years of age, a student at St. John's College, Cambridge. In four years he obtained a degree, and was ordained to an Essex curacy. From Essex this strong-limbed and handsome Irishman, having thus fought his way, without help from his family or friends, from humble poverty to a respectable rank, removed to Yorkshire. While holding a curacy at Hartshead, he fell in love with Miss Branwell, an orphan niece of a neighbouring clergyman, then on a visit from Cornwall. She had been brought up amongst Methodists, of the best kind of that widely varying sect; for Mrs. Gaskell describes the family as possessed of refinement and purity of character, the fruits of their gentle and sincere piety. The incumbent of Hartshead, then "a very handsome fellow, full of Irish enthusiasm," married, in 1812, Maria Branwell, described to us as a person *petite* in figure, but very elegant, simple in her tastes, with a great store of good sense. Their means, though small, were with economy equal to their unambitious state; and both of them had passed the period of early youth.

When Charlotte was in her fourth year, Mr. Brontë removed to Haworth, one of several chapelries in the extensive parish of Bradford, in Yorkshire. The country round Haworth partakes largely of the desolate moorland character which belongs to much of the manufacturing district of the West Riding of York. The climate is harsh, the scenery is bold, but rugged and uninviting to the lover of the mere picturesque. A "grey, neutral tint" covers every object far and near. The people who dwell in this busy and thriving district are a very distinctly marked race,

rough as their own climate in speech, independent in thought and character, much given to Dissent in religion and extreme Liberalism in politics, "full of grim humour," wilful and sometimes under provocation lawless, yet not essentially unkindly, and prevailingly honest and just. We have never met in any biography descriptions of scenery and the manners of a people more graphic and discriminating, than the picturesque but accurate sketch which Mrs. Gaskell gives in her early chapters of the district and the people of Haworth. It will be seen as we proceed how essential a part of her subject this was, and how potent the local and personal influences which surrounded Charlotte Brontë's youth were in moulding her tastes and fancies. We can only extract a few short passages:

"These men are keen and shrewd; faithful and persevering in following out a good purpose, fell in tracking an evil one. They are not emotional; they are not easily made into either friends or enemies; but once lovers or haters, it is difficult to change their feeling. They are a powerful race both in mind and body, both for good and for evil. * * * Their independence of character, their dislike of authority, and their strong powers of thought, predisposed them to rebellion against the religious dictations of such men as Laud, and the arbitrary rule of the Stuarts; and the injury done by James and Charles to the trade by which they gained their bread, made the great majority of them Commonwealth men. * * * The descendants of many who served under Cromwell at Dunbar, live on the same lands as their ancestors occupied then; and perhaps there is no part of England where the traditional and fond recollections of the Commonwealth have lingered so long as in that inhabited by the woollen manufacturing population of the West Riding, who had the restrictions taken off their trade by the Protector's admirable commercial policy. I have it on good authority that, not thirty years ago, the phrase, 'in Oliver's days,' was in common use to denote a time of unusual prosperity. The class of Christian names prevalent in a district is one indication of the direction in which its tide of hero-worship sets. Grave enthusiasts in politics or religion perceive not the ludicrous side of those which they give to their children; and some are to be found, still in their infancy, not a dozen miles from Haworth, that will have to go through life as Lamartine, Kossuth, and Dembinsky. And so there is a testimony to what I have said, of the traditional feeling of the district, in the fact that the Old Testament names in general use among the Puritans are yet the prevalent appellations in most Yorkshire families of middle or humble rank, whatever their religious persuasion may be. There are numerous records, too, that show the kindly way in which the ejected ministers were received by the gentry, as well as by the poorer part of the inhabitants, during the persecuting days of Charles II. * * * The abundance of coal, and the number of mountain streams in the district, make it highly favourable to manufactures; and accordingly, as I stated, the inhabitants have for centuries been engaged in making cloth, as well as in agricultural pursuits. But the intercourse of trade failed, for a long time, to bring amenity and civilization into these outlying hamlets, or widely scattered dwellings. Mr. Hunter, in his 'Life of Oliver Heywood,' quotes a

sentence out of a memorial of one James Rither, living in the reign of Elizabeth, which is partially true to this day—"They have no superior to court, no civilities to practise: a sour and sturdy humour is the consequence, so that a stranger is shocked by a tone of defiance in every voice, and an air of fierceness in every countenance." Even now, a stranger can hardly ask a question without receiving some crusty reply, if, indeed, he receive any at all. Sometimes the sour rudeness amounts to positive insult. Yet, if the 'foreigner' takes all this churlishness good-humouredly, or as a matter of course, and makes good any claim upon their latent kindness and hospitality, they are faithful and generous, and thoroughly to be relied upon."—I. 12—16.

Haworth parsonage, the home of Charlotte Brontë during a large portion of her life, was not a building at all calculated to make amends for its bleak aspect by its own gracefulness or superabundant means of comfort. It was and is a low, oblong stone building, situated on the brow of a hill, "with a still higher background of sweeping moors," surrounded on three sides by the grave-yard of the church, the western door of which faces, at the distance of a hundred yards, the entrance of the parsonage. Sanatory considerations weighed not with the builders of Haworth parsonage a century ago, or they would have removed the clergyman's dwelling out of the reach of the miasma of the fetid vapours rising from an ill-drained and extensive burial-ground. It was in every respect a sad spot for a delicate woman in declining health, and overtaken with a large family of little ones. A sixth child, Anne, was, we suppose, born after the removal of the family to Haworth.* The mother never recovered her strength after the birth of this child, and died in September, 1821. Charlotte was at this period only five years of age, and Maria, her eldest sister, not eight. A gloomier childhood than that of the motherless Brontës can scarcely be conceived. Their father, stern in his manners, with little fondness or aptitude for children, was a recluse, partly by taste and partly from necessity, in consequence of a derangement of the digestive functions. Even during the last months of their mother's life, they saw little of her. "Knowing how soon they were to be left motherless," she could not bear their presence in her sick chamber. They became at an early period still, noiseless creatures, almost without a whisper pursuing their several occupations in the little room in the parsonage set apart to their use. Their walks were exclusively on the dreary moors which rose behind their dwell-

* Mrs. Gaskell represents the six children as born before the family removed to Haworth, but this is manifestly inconsistent with the date given (at Vol. I. p. 8) of Anne Brontë's death, "aged 27 years, May 28th, 1849." If this part of the monumental inscription is correct, Anne, the youngest of the family, could not have been born before 1821, the year after the Brontë family settled at Haworth. At p. 88 also, Mrs. Gaskell, mentioning Anne in connection with the date, June 31, 1829, speaks of her as "little Anne, aged scarcely eight." There need be the less reserve in pointing out the mistake, as the work gives in its general texture abundant marks of painstaking fidelity.

ing; they had few friends either to visit or to be visited by. Their physical frame, naturally small and feeble, was not nurtured into strength by judicious treatment. Their father was a stern theorist. Remembering probably the lenten food of his own youth, he resolved that they should be brought up in similar abstinence from animal food. He desired also to harden them in other ways than making them indifferent to the pleasures of the palate. His notions as to the dress suitable to children were equally stern and eccentric. Some anecdotes given by Mrs. Gaskell of his singular ways, the knowledge of which she deemed necessary to the right understanding of his daughter's life, are of a kind which it is not easy to reconcile with ordinary sanity. A ruthless war with finery, extending to silk dresses, smart rugs, and even children's shoes, some of which he furtively consigned to the fire and others he cut to pieces,—the blowing off the steam of an irritated temper by firing in rapid succession pistols out of the back door, and the sawing off the backs of some of the chairs of the simply furnished parsonage,—were some of the freaks of this singular man. It will excite no surprise that the children of such a parent grew up very unlike the ordinary run of human beings, reserved and externally cold, yet with deep emotions sternly compressed in their hearts. They were singularly precocious in their ideas and talents. There is something deeply affecting in the picture which Mrs. Gaskell draws of these children, walking hand-in-hand across the moors, the elder ones watching over the toddling wee things with maternal care.

"The children did not want society. To small infantine gaieties they were unaccustomed. They were all in all to each other. I do not suppose that there ever was a family more tenderly bound to each other. Maria read the newspapers, and reported intelligence to her younger sisters which it is wonderful they could take an interest in. But I suspect that they had no 'children's books,' and that their eager minds 'browzed undisturbed among the wholesome pasturage of English literature,' as Charles Lamb expresses it."—I. 57.

Mr. Brontë has himself supplied some very remarkable reminiscences of the early days of his gifted children :

"When mere children, as soon as they could read and write, Charlotte and her brothers and sisters used to invent and act little plays of their own, in which the Duke of Wellington, my daughter Charlotte's hero, was sure to come off conqueror; when a dispute would not unfrequently arise amongst them regarding the comparative merits of him, Buonaparte, Hannibal, and Caesar. When the argument got warm, and rose to its height, as their mother was then dead, I had sometimes to come in as arbitrator, and settle the dispute according to the best of my judgment. Generally, in the management of these concerns, I frequently thought that I discovered signs of rising talent, which I had seldom or never before seen in any of their age. . . . A circumstance now occurs to my mind which I may as well mention. When my children were very young, when, as far as I can remember, the oldest was about ten years

of age, and the youngest about four, thinking that they knew more than I had yet discovered, in order to make them speak with less timidity, I deemed that if they were put under a sort of cover I might gain my end; and happening to have a mask in the house, I told them all to stand and speak boldly from under cover of the mask.

"I began with the youngest (Anne, afterwards Acton Bell), and asked what a child like her most wanted; she answered, 'Age and experience.' I asked the next (Emily, afterwards Ellis Bell), what I had best do with her brother Branwell, who was sometimes a naughty boy; she answered, 'Reason with him, and when he won't listen to reason, whip him.' I asked Branwell what was the best way of knowing the difference between the intellects of men and women; he answered, 'By considering the difference between them as to their bodies.' I then asked Charlotte what was the best book in the world; she answered, 'The Bible.' And what was the next best; she answered, 'The Book of Nature.' I then asked the next what was the best mode of education for a woman; she answered, 'That which would make her rule her house well.' Lastly, I asked the oldest what was the best mode of spending time; she answered, 'By laying it out in preparation for a happy eternity.' I may not have given precisely their words, but I have nearly done so, as they made a deep and lasting impression on my memory. The substance, however, was exactly what I have stated."—I. 58—60.

How strange these questions to be put to children!—and the answers given to them shew that, young as the little Brontës were, their education, irregular as it had been, was far in advance of their years. They received from their surviving parent the formal instruction given in set lessons; but of that invaluable knowledge given by parents to their offspring, at times and in modes when the purpose of instruction is least suspected, they received from their father little. The indirect education and discipline by which children profit most, came to them from their own talk, from the books and newspapers in Haworth parsonage, and from the conversation of the clergy who occasionally were its guests. A maiden aunt took charge of the household about a year after the death of their mother. From her the girls learnt sewing and housewifery.

In her ninth year, Charlotte was placed in a school established in the North of England for the daughters of clergymen. It was not exclusively a charitable institution, as the parents had to pay with each pupil about £14 a-year. Its founder was a clergyman of Kirby Lonsdale, the Rev. William Carus Wilson. The premises of the school were situated at Cowan's Bridge, a romantic spot on the high road from Leeds to Kendal. They were, as far as sanatory precautions were concerned, totally unfit for the reception of a large number of boarders. The domestic arrangements were under the control of an old servant of Mr. Wilson. Under her gross mismanagement—for she was careless, dirty and wasteful—the diet of the pupils, notwithstanding a tolerable provision of food, in both quality and quantity became

insufficient and disgusting. Four of the Brontës were, unhappily for themselves, pupils in this ill-managed institution. Charlotte's elder sisters had preceded her there by about three months. She herself and Emily were taken to Cowan's Bridge school in September, 1824. Among the teachers there was one woman of cruel nature, who delighted to worry and torment her pupils. Against the eldest Brontë she had conceived, spite of her talents and attainments, which were far in advance of all her companions, intense dislike, and she used her power without mercy. The Sundays were passed by these unhappy clergymen's daughters at Tunstall church, two miles distant from Cowan's Bridge. Their Sunday walk exposed them to cold and damp. They took their cold dinner with them, and ate it in a small apartment over the church porch. There was no vigilant, skilful and benevolent eye watching over the health of these ill-used girls. The consequence of their repeated exposure to cold, of unsuitable food and bad drainage, was, that in 1825 forty of the pupils were prostrated by typhus fever. It needed not, however, the aid of fever to destroy the elder sisters of Charlotte. The other agents of death had done their work effectually. In this same year Maria became so rapidly worse, that her father was suddenly sent for. He took his emaciated daughter home: she reached Haworth alive, but died a few days after. Elizabeth followed her to an early grave in less than two months; and Charlotte thus became, in her tenth year, the eldest of a motherless family. She and her sister Emily returned once more to Cowan's Bridge; but the dampness of the house, lying on the brink of a mountain stream, often swollen by torrents into a flood, was evidently destroying their health, and before the winter they left for ever a place associated in their minds with so much that was repugnant and painful. With what fearful power Charlotte Brontë reproduced the scene of her first schooling, and how her indignation flashed lightning-like around the heads of the authors of her own and her companions' sufferings, we shall see hereafter.

For five years Charlotte remained at home, picking up knowledge in many indirect ways, but receiving little systematic instruction from her eccentric and recluse father. The amusements of the children so strangely left to themselves during a large portion of their early youth, partook little of childish sports, but were sedentary and intellectual. She had already become an authoress, and there yet remain as monuments of her literary industry at this period of her life two-and-twenty MS. volumes, written in characters so delicately minute, that they are illegible to the unassisted eye, and can only be deciphered by the help of a powerful microscope. Mrs. Gaskell has detected in some of these early compositions gleams of the remarkable intellectual characteristics of the authoress of "*Jane Eyre*,"

"Shirley" and "Villette;" but from the few specimens given of them, they would scarcely appear entitled to particular notice.

Early in 1831, Charlotte became a pupil in the school of the Miss Woolers at Roe Head, between Leeds and Huddersfield. Here she was the associate of seven or eight schoolfellows, who alternately wondered at her ignorance of some common attainments, such as grammar and geography, and at the accuracy of her knowledge of other things, usually far beyond the range of school girls' lore.

"She was an indefatigable student: constantly reading and learning; with a strong conviction of the necessity and value of education, very unusual in a girl of fifteen. She never lost a moment of time, and seemed almost to grudge the necessary leisure for relaxation and play-hours, which might be partly accounted for by the awkwardness in all games occasioned by her shortness of sight. Yet, in spite of these unsociable habits, she was a great favourite with her schoolfellows. She was always ready to try and do what they wished, though not sorry when they called her awkward, and left her out of their sports. Then, at night, she was an invaluable story-teller, frightening them almost out of their wits as they lay in bed. On one occasion the effect was such that she was led to scream out loud, and Miss Wooler, coming upstairs, found that one of the listeners had been seized with violent palpitations, in consequence of the excitement produced by Charlotte's story." I. 111, 112.

The two years passed by Charlotte Brontë at Roe Head were among the few bright and happy periods of her life; for she felt deeply grateful to her teacher, who was equally kind and skilful; she was beloved by her companions, who appreciated both her character and her talents; and she was imbibing knowledge with an intellectual thirst in eagerness seldom surpassed. One kind of knowledge especially the pupil was largely gaining, which furnished to the future literary artiste striking subjects. The old dwellings of the district, the traditions which clung around them, the strongly-marked features in the character of the common people amongst whom her daily walks were taken, and the recollections, ably narrated by Miss Wooler, of the various events in public and private life which had fallen under her observation—all these things were noted indelibly in the mind and memory of Charlotte Brontë, to be in after years reproduced with ideal combinations on which genius would place her unmistakeable mark.

On her return to Haworth, she became the teacher of her sisters; adding, however, to her own previous acquirements the accomplishment of drawing, which she learnt from a master in common with her pupils. Shyness and reserve were the characteristic of all the sisters. They taught in the Sunday-school, but even this Christian labour does not seem to have given a wholesome and natural expansion to their neighbourly sympathies; for we are told they "were shy of meeting even familiar faces,

and were scrupulous about entering the house of the very poorest uninvited ;" " they never faced their kind voluntarily, and always preferred the solitude and freedom of the moors."

Not the least gifted of this remarkable family was Branwell, the only son. His father and sisters recognized in him talents early and strongly developed, though most irregularly educated. In the family consultations as to the pathway of his future life, one scheme was that he should devote himself to art, for which he appeared to have considerable aptitude ; and it was their desire that he might become a pupil in the Royal Academy. To eke out the scanty family means, Charlotte, ever ready to make any personal sacrifice for those she loved, prepared to go from home and undertake the duties of a governess. She found a situation in the establishment of her friend, Miss Wooler, the advantages of which were personal rather than pecuniary. She was accompanied by the sister next to herself in age, but this arrangement was of short duration. Emily Jane Brontë possessed all the strength of will and noble independence that marked her race, but she also had the family reserve and pride to a morbid extent, and her aversion to sympathy amounted almost to a mania. Torn for the first time from all (except her sister Charlotte) whom she cared to love, exposed to the discipline of a school abhorrent to her love of freedom, she pined for the seclusion of Haworth parsonage and the lonely walk on the wild moor, and presently sickened, and, in her sister's belief, would have died had she not returned home. The youngest daughter, Anne, took her place in the school. After a time, Miss Wooler removed to Dewsbury Moor ; the change was no improvement, the site of the house being low, and the air less pure than at Roe Head. Anne suffered from the change ; some alarming symptoms appeared, and she was hastily taken home. Charlotte was herself ill, her strength exhausted with the incessant toil of teaching—for to her it was rather a toil than a labour of love ; her nerves were shattered, and she needed as much as her sister the quiet restorative of pure air and home ways and feelings. But Branwell had not yet settled to anything ; and Emily, who had again made the experiment of life away from home as a teacher in a school at Halifax, had returned with wearied wing to the home nest. In the spirit of self-sacrifice which woman so often exercises, Charlotte returned to her weary work at Dewsbury Moor ; but her strength was not long equal to the labour. She broke down so entirely, that her medical adviser told her if she valued life she must go home. At Haworth parsonage she presently regained health sufficiently to renew her schemes for useful and productive exertion. Before this, the idea of literary employment had occupied the minds of the young people in the parsonage. Branwell had written to Wordsworth, and Charlotte to Southey, asking advice, and enclosing specimens of their poetry. The answer of the latter was

not encouraging. The poet-critic gave his correspondent credit for the "faculty of verse," but warned her against indulging in "day-dreams likely to induce a distempered state of mind," and laid down the canon against female authorship as the business of life, which many persons, and those not all of the gentler sex, will perhaps be disposed to question, that "literature cannot be the business of a woman's life, and it ought not to be." In that good English which Southey knew so well how to write, he warned her against the neglect of real duties for the sake of imaginative pleasures, of writing for the love of fame and for the selfish excitement of emulation. There have been few human beings gifted with great literary talent who less needed to be warned against the neglect of the real duties of life than Charlotte Brontë. Had Southey known more about her, he would probably have written in a different strain. As it was, she extracted good from the advice, which she characterized as "kind and admirable; a little stringent."

Southey evidently alluded to marriage and domestic duties as the proper substitute in woman for the love of celebrity. She might, had she chosen, have tried about this time the value of her correspondent's supposed prescription, for her hand was sought in marriage in the spring of 1839 by a young clergyman, said to have been an amiable man. She did not feel towards him that warmth of attachment which would justify her acceptance of him. "Matrimony did not enter into the scheme of her life, but good, sound, earnest labour did;" and accordingly, with recovered strength, she entered on another stage of laborious duty, accepting the situation of a governess. She was not fortunate in her new relations with rich but ignorant and intensely vulgar people, "proud as peacocks and wealthy as Jews." They had not the intelligence which enabled them to appreciate the ability and high-mindedness of the lady whose services they had secured for their children. It makes one's heart beat indignantly to read of the affronts put upon her by the mother of the children to whom she was nobly doing her duty under every conceivable discouragement. Here is a sample of the way in which persons entrusted with the most important and not least dignified of human duties, the education of the young, are sometimes treated by their employers:

"She had been entrusted with the care of a little boy, three or four years old, during the absence of his parents on a day's excursion, and particularly enjoined to keep him out of the stable-yard. His elder brother, a lad of eight or nine, and not a pupil of Miss Brontë's, tempted the little fellow into the forbidden place. She followed, and tried to induce him to come away; but, instigated by his brother, he began throwing stones at her, and one of them hit her so severe a blow on the temple that the lads were alarmed into obedience. The next day, in full family conclave, the mother asked Miss Brontë what occasioned the

mark on her forehead. She simply replied, 'An accident, ma'am,' and no further inquiry was made; but the children (both brothers and sisters) had been present, and honoured her for not 'telling tales.' From that time, she began to gain influence over all, more or less, according to their different characters; and as she insensibly gained their affection, her own interest in them was increasing. But one day, at the children's dinner, the small truant of the stable-yard, in a little demonstrative gush, said, putting his hand in hers, 'I love 'ou, Miss Brontë.' Whereupon, the mother exclaimed, before all the children, 'Love the *governess*, my dear!'—I. 190, 191.

We thank Mrs. Gaskell for the rebuke which this part of the *Life* gives to the vulgar insolence, or at best the cool indifference, with which some, even in the middle class of English society, allow themselves to treat governesses. The name of the family, and every clue by which they may be detected, are properly withheld. It is probable enough that these volumes may never attract the notice of the persons from whom Miss Brontë received indignities (for even a slight addiction to literature would have cured their "density of perception"); but should they ever read the beautiful and touching letters written by this lady when in the service of her Yorkshire taskmistress, we do not envy them their emotions. This uncongenial engagement soon terminated, but not till her health had begun to give way.

On her return home, the sisters revolved a scheme of opening a girls' school. This would have enabled them to have Emily's help, whose *idiosyncrasy* limited her powers of usefulness to Haworth parsonage. But there were difficulties in the way,—some financial, others resulting from their want of a wide connection of friends,—and nothing was done. Again Charlotte tried, and this time with better results, the life of a governess. She was valued and was happy; but the emoluments of the situation were paltry, and gave no promise of ever making her independent in circumstances. Her next change was to an establishment in Brussels, where she sought and found able instruction in the language and literature of France. She was accompanied by her sister Emily. M. Héger, the husband of the lady whose pupils they had become, was an able teacher, whose instructions went far beyond the language in which his pupils dressed their thoughts, and from whose thoughtful hints they derived general intellectual cultivation. In addition to French, they studied German, music and drawing. Such was their progress, that at the end of the brief term to which on going their plans were limited, they received and accepted a proposal to stay and assist in the conduct of the school. The death of the good maiden aunt who for twenty years had presided over the establishment at Haworth, called the two sisters suddenly home. Her little property was divided amongst her nieces. As it now became necessary for one of the sisters to

remain at home, Emily took that department of duty, and Charlotte returned to Brussels. The English teacher in this huge Belgian school, no longer cheered by a sister's company, felt sad and home-sick. Her passion for lonely walks and solitary evenings tended to increase her constitutional melancholy. Between Mad. Héger and herself an estrangement of feeling grew up, the consequence of Charlotte's increasing distaste to Popery, with better acquaintance with its forms and insight into its influences. Her state of feeling was such that a slight cause was sufficient to remove her from Belgium; and when she learnt that her father was ill and anxious about his eyesight, she suddenly quitted Brussels and returned to Haworth.

Restored to the bosom of her family, a growing anxiety presently developed itself, which was long a source of trouble to all of them. Branwell, first unstable, had rapidly progressed in evil, and soon became a wretchedly degraded being, the cause of perpetual grief and terror to those that bore his name. In nothing had he succeeded. A railway clerkship gave him temporary employment; then he became tutor in a family. The discovery of an intrigue, in which he was not supposed to be the seducer, with the mother of his pupils, drove him home covered with infamy. He endeavoured to drown the remonstrances of conscience in frequent intoxication. Such a life will not bear being described too minutely. His sisters bore this bitter trial as they best could, and it continued and grew in bitterness until he who was the cause of their wretchedness ceased to live. Discarded by the partner of his sin, now a widow rich and gay, he could not find even the miserable relief of a counter irritation in hating her who had cast a blight over his life. The outpouring of the biographer's indignation against this woman, who "lives still in May Fair," is one of the finest pieces of eloquence in the whole book.

Before that year, 1848, the annals of which were so dreary to the family at Haworth, had come to a close, the grave opened for another of Mr. Brontë's children. Emily succumbed to an illness in which till the last day she sternly refused medical aid and even sisterly sympathy. What the trial was to her sister Charlotte, an extract from one of her letters may help us to imagine.

"Never in all her life had she lingered over any task that lay before her, and she did not linger now. She sank rapidly. She made haste to leave us. . . . Day by day, when I saw with what a front she met suffering, I looked on her with an anguish of wonder and love. I have seen nothing like it; but, indeed, I have never seen her parallel in anything. Stronger than a man, simpler than a child, her nature stood alone. The awful point was that, while full of ruth for others, on herself she had no pity; the spirit was inexorable to the flesh; from the trembling hands, the unnerved limbs, the fading eyes, the same service was exacted as they had rendered in health. To stand by and witness this, and not dare to remonstrate, was a pain no words can render."—II. 80.

A touching anecdote is told respecting a favourite dog belonging to Emily Brontë. By her daring and strength of will she had conquered this savage animal, which was of the bull-dog species. "Keeper" joined the sad funeral group, the father and his two surviving daughters, followed them quietly into the church, and when all was over he came back to the parsonage, and, as if he now realized the loss of his mistress, lay down at her chamber door, and for some days howled piteously. This was in December, 1848. The following spring made another breach in this doomed family,—Anne, the youngest daughter, dying (also a victim of consumption) at Scarborough, where she was attended while living, and buried when dead, by her sole surviving sister.

It was well that Charlotte Brontë, before her home was thus made desolate by the removal of all except her father, had found occupation for her thoughts in the successful cultivation of literature. Her first essay was in conjunction with the two sisters whose deaths have just been spoken of. They united in 1845 in the publication of a volume of poems, and veiled their own names under those of Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell, the pseudonyms for Charlotte, Emily and Anne Brontë. The volume failed to attract the notice of the public, but Charlotte ever retained a high opinion of the merits of the poems contributed to it by her sister Emily. The sisters, finding their poetry unappreciated, turned to prose composition. The results were three short works of fiction, of which Charlotte's is only now about to be given to the public. It is entitled "The Professor." The rejection of it by a publisher fell upon her when she was attending her father at Manchester, and on the very day he was to undergo an operation for cataract. In the lonely hours and days of that anxious visit, undeterred by previous failure, she began the composition of "Jane Eyre," the work that won her a secure place amongst English writers of fiction. The germ of the story is said to have been an incident which she heard when at Miss Wooler's school. To illustrate a theory of her own, which she had to defend against the opinions and practice of her sisters, she made her heroine devoid of beauty and insignificant in stature. The story carried her back in thought to her first wretched school days, and in Lowood we have a too graphic representation of the horrors of the establishment at Cowan's Bridge. Mrs. Gaskell admits that, had Charlotte Brontë foreseen the world-wide fame of her book, she might have softened some of the darker shades in the picture of Lowood. The novel was published in the autumn of 1847. From the reviews, except the "Examiner," it received but stinted praise; but the public soon pronounced by its eager inquiries the verdict of a great success. The approval continued to grow, spite of a severe attack on the book in the "Quarterly." This is the mode in which Mrs. Gaskell,

as wisely as generously, treats the objection to *Jane Eyre* that it was coarse in some of its details:

"I do not deny for myself the existence of coarseness here and there in her works, otherwise so entirely noble. I only ask those who read them to consider her life,—which has been openly laid bare before them,—and to say how it could be otherwise. She saw few men; and among these few were one or two with whom she had been acquainted since early girlhood,—who had shown her much friendliness and kindness,—through whose family she had received many pleasures,—for whose intellect she had a great respect,—but who talked before her, if not to her, with as little reticence as Rochester talked to *Jane Eyre*. Take this in connection with her poor brother's sad life, and the outspoken people among whom she lived,—remember her strong feeling of the duty of representing life as it really is, not as it ought to be,—and then do her justice for all that she was, and all that she would have been (had God spared her), rather than censure her because circumstances forced her to touch pitch, as it were, and by it her hand was for a moment defiled. It was but skin-deep. Every change in her life was purifying her; it hardly could raise her. Again I cry, 'If she had but lived!'"—II. 281, 282.

The large infusion of reality in her fictions—the way in which she combined with pure creations the results of individual experience and personal observation—is a subject of great interest, as illustrating the laws of imagination and the philosophy of fictitious composition. We know of no English work which contains a more curious illustration than this *Biography of the relations of fact and fiction*. In "*Shirley*," which followed "*Jane Eyre*," who does not remember the matchless chapter touching the curates in the opening of the story? "*Mr. Donne*," "*Mr. Malone*" and "*Mr. Sweeting*," so busily occupied with "*settling the Dissenters*," are real flesh-and-blood "*successors of the apostles*." The character of *Shirley* is that of *Emily Brontë*. In *Villette* we have a copy, minute and faithful almost as a Dutch picture, of the life she lived at Brussels.

Two events only remain to be told of *Charlotte Brontë's* life. In 1854, she gave her hand in marriage to *Mr. Nicholls*, one of her father's curates, who won her by his unpretending worth, and patient, persevering love. She continued to live with her father in the accustomed parsonage. Some months of the purest happiness were succeeded by distressing illness, and before the first year of her married life was completed, "the solemn tolling of *Haworth church-bell* spoke forth the fact of her death to the villagers who had known her from a child, and whose hearts shivered within them as they thought of the two sitting desolate and alone in the old grey house."

Thus passed away, in the 39th year of her age, one who, gifted with rare talents and imbued with clear and high notions of duty, to which she clung with resolute principle, was yet doomed to more than the common lot of mortal sorrow. It was the re-

mark of one of her mourning friends, "All her life was but labour and pain, and she never threw down the burden for the sake of present pleasure." To her were not allotted even the brief and delusive pleasures of hopefulness; for from early youth depression marked her as its own. How sharply does a life like this, filled up with duty and with sorrow, point the argument for another life, in which there shall be an everlasting compensation of joy, and hope shall not be needed to increase abundant bliss!

If in her life Charlotte Brontë was not as happy as she deserved to be, her memory is well protected by the reverent mind and loving heart of her biographer, who closes her book with an appeal on behalf of her departed friend to those "who know how to look with tender humility at faults and errors, how to admire generously extraordinary genius, and how to reverence with warm, full hearts all noble virtue."

We cannot bring our task to an end without repeating Mrs. Gaskell's significant words, "If she had but lived!" Had she been permitted to enjoy some years of that happiness which had just dawned upon her—had her heart warmed with a mother's joy—had her conscientious and inflexible sense of duty been directed to the education of children of her own,—how rich might have been the fruits! On the basis of such happy domestic experiences as we have supposed, how beautiful the edifice which her fancy might have constructed! The faculty of Hope might then have developed itself in her mind, and her name might have been associated with ideal pictures of tenderness and gushing love and domestic happiness and winning virtue, not less powerful than those more repulsive characters and incidents around which, in *Jane Eyre* and *Shirley*, her genius succeeded in throwing a wonderful amount of interest.

LETTER OF JOHN PAGET, ESQ., TO THE REV. JOHN KENRICK.

MY DEAR SIR,

York, April 21.

MAY I request you to insert in your next number, the accompanying letter from my friend and former pupil, Mr. Paget? His character and position are a sufficient guarantee to the Unitarians of England of the correctness of his statements and the urgency of the appeal which he makes, on behalf of our brethren in Transylvania. The congregation of St. Saviourgate has promptly responded to it, by appointing collections to be made on Sunday, May 3rd; and I trust that the Unitarians throughout England will manifest, in this or a similar way, their sympathy with their persecuted brethren.—Yours truly,

JOHN KENRICK.

Klausenburg, March 4th, 1857.

My dear Sir,—I have just had a visit from our Bishop—Moses Szekely, whom I think you know, and our Minister here—Professor Krisza, who knows you, at least by name, to request me to assist them in applying to England and America to help them in the difficulties under which they labour. I have been so long absent from England myself, that I have necessarily lost the means of interesting many persons in their behalf; and I do not know what to recommend as the best means of arriving at the object they have in view. It is under these circumstances that, trusting to your kindness towards myself and your zeal for the good cause, I venture to trouble you with our affairs, and to beg that you would give us your assistance and advice as to the best mode of proceeding.

The immediate cause of the appeal is the following:—

The Austrian Government, in pursuit of its policy of Germanizing Hungary, has begun a series of inroads on the freedom of education, which not only endangers the nationality of the Hungarians, but still more their Protestantism. Before the Revolution, the schools of all the Protestants were completely in their own hands, both with respect to the system of education, the appointment of Professors, and the disposition of the funds. Since that time, however, the Austrian Government, although still allowing a certain independence, has, nevertheless, by a succession of arbitrary decrees materially interfered with the course of instruction to be pursued, as well as with the numbers and emoluments of the teachers to be employed. In fact, in order to retain the privileges of state schools, by which alone they are entitled to grant certificates and degrees, essential to the pursuit of the learned professions, as well as the holding of all public employments, whether judicial or political, the Government requires that the schools and colleges of Transylvania shall be modelled on the system of those of Austria. But the schools of Austria are supported by the State, and it is therefore an easy matter for the Minister who regulates them to provide for their support. Of course the power which supports enjoys an unrestrained influence over them—an influence which has been in Austria openly delegated to the Jesuits. In Transylvania, however, the Protestant schools have been hitherto entirely supported by funds derived from charitable foundations, or from present contributions. These, albeit in the case of the Unitarians small, have been hitherto found sufficient for the support of a College or upper Gymnasium in Klausenburg, and two under Gymnasias, one in Thorda, the other in Keresztur in the Szekler land. The payment of the Professors has been, it is true, very modest, but with this they would have been content. Their number, too, has been small, but they have made up for it by increased diligence; so that, although each Professor was often obliged to lecture on several subjects, and to deliver several lectures every day, these schools have always maintained so good a character, that many students of other confessions have always been found on their lists. The Austrian Government, on the paternal principle of mixing in everything, and perhaps in hopes of eventually bringing the whole direction of the schools entirely under its own influence, has insisted on a great increase in the payment of the Professors, and, at the same time, a great increase in their numbers. If the Consistory cannot shew by a certain day that

they are able to fulfil these conditions, the schools are to be closed, or to be deprived of their privilege as public schools, and consequently of their right to grant degrees. By this measure the Unitarian youth will be excluded from all the learned professions, as well as from all public employments; or they will be obliged to seek their education in schools where their religious principles would be continually endangered by attempts at proselytism. It is possible that the schools might receive aid from the Government on submitting themselves entirely to Government control. Nor would this involve any great hardship where the religion and language of the people and Government were the same; but neither is the case in Transylvania; and the recent attempts of the Austrian Government to Catholicize the Protestants, and to deprive the whole Magyar population of the use of their own language, by the forced introduction of German as the medium of instruction in the schools, have excited a most intense feeling of fear and hatred amongst all classes of society. You may judge of the impression created among the Unitarians, by the result it has produced in the form of contributions to resist it. Hitherto the whole property of the Unitarian schools, independent of the college buildings and Professors' houses, amounted only to about £6,000; from the interest of which the three Institutions above named have been almost entirely supported,—for the fee paid by the students is almost nothing, only a few shillings—and the contributions very small. Now to provide a capital sufficient to produce the annual revenue required by the new regulations, this sum must be raised to £20,000. And although the Unitarians do not altogether amount to 50,000 souls, and the greater part of these is composed of the poor mountaineers of the Szekler land, it is confidently expected that no less a sum than £12,000 will be raised—£5,000 in larger sums, varying from £200 to £1, collected in the towns and from the wealthier members of the body, and £6,000 from the clergy, schoolmasters, and parishioners of the poorer villages. To those who know the poverty of this country in general, and especially of the Unitarian body, the collection of such a sum would have been considered an impossibility, and nothing but the zeal which is ever the fruit of persecution could have produced it.

This sum, however, far as it is beyond what even the most sanguine expected, is yet far below the amount required. Under these circumstances the Consistory have requested me to inquire if they could hope for any assistance from their brethren in England and America. I know no one, to whom I can apply, more able, and, I feel convinced, more willing, to aid us with your advice in this matter than yourself. The only road commonly open to the purse of the public is that of agitation through the press; but this is more or less closed against the Transylvanian Unitarians; for it would be sure to draw down upon them the vengeance of the Austrian Government. Had there been any person here capable of expressing himself fluently in English, I should have recommended that such a person should have been sent to England and America, where, by visiting the different Unitarian congregations, and explaining the peculiar merits of the case, I should have felt little doubt that aid might have been attained. But although several of the Unitarian clergy can read English, and are well acquainted with English literature, there are none who speak it sufficiently well to undertake

such a task. Under these circumstances I can think of no other means of obtaining our end, than by interesting the Unitarian Association in our case, and inducing them to issue circular letters to the various ministers and congregations recommending collections for our benefit. Should this plan meet your approval, might I request you to put it in a practical form, and further it by your recommendation. You may readily believe I would not have undertaken to lay this request before you, had I not been fully convinced of the immense importance of the question. Towards the East, Transylvania forms the last home of Protestantism; in that direction there is neither hope nor sympathy to be looked for. The Austrian Government for many years attempted to reduce the Protestants to obedience by the brutal persecutions of a former age: they now attempt the same thing by the more dangerous means of tampering with education. Fortunately, however slow and insidious as have been the methods of attack, the attention of the people has been roused, and a stubborn spirit of opposition excited, which promises the best results. The will is there, as they have already shewn, but the power is really wanting to meet the extravagant demands of the Government. Help us if you can, for I am afraid alone we shall scarcely be able to maintain our position.

Yours, &c. &c.,

JOHN PAGET.

CHRIST'S RISING FROM THE TOMB A PLEDGE AND PATTERN OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY.

SIR,

I MAINTAIN that though our deceased friends do not rise bodily from the dead the third day, Christ's bodily resurrection, and his ascension as related by Luke, last chapter, and declared to us by himself through John (xx. 17), *may* rightly be termed "a sample, specimen, and therein a pledge and proof of human immortality;" and have ever been felt as such by the churches of Christ. I cannot help wishing to record in your pages a protest against the application by a correspondent in your last No., of the epithets, "most strange, absurd and unscriptural," to a view so decidedly espoused by CHANNING. See the first part of his sermon "On the Future Life." He is also followed thus by one of his living countrymen: "Facts have much greater power than arguments over the human mind. The natural course of reason is to generalize, to deduce general truths and principles from particular facts, and not to infer particular facts from general principles. . . . God having raised Christ from the dead, who had preached the doctrine of immortality, He left mankind to the conclusion of their own reason whether death were necessarily the destruction of our being, and whether it were not the purpose of the Creator of man to raise him to a new and immortal life. God knew the principles of the human mind which He addressed . . . and the result has commended the wisdom of the arrangement."

T. J. READ.

Stockton-on-Tees, March 15, 1857.

INTELLIGENCE.

NEW UNITARIAN CHAPEL AT SWINTON.

Swinton, a populous and increasingly important township in the parish of Eccles, is distant between four and five miles from Manchester. Here, about the year 1820, the late Mr. Samuel Boardman, an intelligent yeoman, invited his neighbours to come and hear readings in his house of the *Christian Reformer*, the first series of which, especially adapted to persons of humble rank, was originated and conducted by the late Rev. Robert Aspland. The experiment was so far successful that presently a small congregation of Unitarian worshippers was formed, Mr. Boardman and his son generally conducting the worship. A Sunday-school was formed, and it and the religious service found sufficient acceptance amongst his neighbours to induce Mr. William Boardman to build on his own land a small school-room or chapel. This was opened on August 14, 1831, by the Rev. J. J. Tayler and the late Rev. J. G. Robberds. During the last twenty-six years, it has been used either as a school-room or a chapel, generally for both purposes, Mr. W. Boardman being assisted in conducting the services by students and ministers of the district. In this pulpit many persons, now of established reputation, made their first hesitating essays as preachers. The school and congregation having outgrown the accommodation of the simple structure of 1831, it was resolved to build a larger and more commodious chapel. By the energy and zeal of Mr. J. Aspinall Turner (recently elected one of the Members for the city of Manchester), a building fund (to which he and Mr. Boardman liberally contributed) has been during the present year raised. A very suitable site has been found on a knoll of land situated in Granville Street, adjoining the mansion and grounds of Mr. Liebert. Sufficient land has been secured for a chapel capable of holding 300 persons, a spacious school-room (30 feet long by 24 feet wide) and a burial-ground. The elevation is to be in the Gothic style, and the building will consist of red and white brick, with substantial stone dressings. The façade will be divided into three sections by buttresses. The entrance will be in the centre of the north wall, and will be surmounted by a three-light

window above. Upon each side there will be five two-light windows, with a substantial buttress between each. It is intended to give a neat finish to the interior. The roof will be open-timbered, and the pews and the organ gallery will be oak-stained.

Saturday, April 17th, the day fixed for the ceremony of laying the foundation-stone, was in every respect favourable for an open-air ceremony, being bright, dry and warm. About four o'clock a large company assembled on the ground, including many ladies. Amongst those whom we noticed were Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., Mr. William Turner, Mr. Carver, Mr. Thos. Baker, Mr. Edward Shawcross, Mr. Milne, Mr. Silas Leigh, Mr. Boardman, Mr. George Taylor, and several ministers, most of whom took a part in the service. The proceedings began with singing the hymn which begins,

This stone to Thee in faith we lay;

We build the temple, Lord, to Thee.

The Sunday scholars, assisted by an harmonium, raised the fine tune of "Oldham" with better success than is commonly attained in out-of-door performances. At the close of the hymn, Mr. Wm. Boardman stepped forward to Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., and offering him a neat mallet and a trowel of silver and ivory, said that he felt great pleasure in having been deputed by the donors to present to him two useful tools,—a mallet, the gift of Mr. Politt, their architect, and a trowel, purchased by the subscriptions of working men and women of that district, who remembered and desired publicly to acknowledge his kindness and that of Mrs. Turner in providing for them during many years a place of worship (viz. at Pendlebury), the services of a minister of religion, a library, lectures upon various subjects, useful and entertaining; and, last though not least, they desired to acknowledge the kindness that, in times of difficulty and distress, led Mr. and Mrs. Turner to aid those who suffered, with their advice, consolation and assistance. Nor could the subscribers pass unnoticed Mr. Turner's enlightened zeal and true liberality as connected with the chapel now about to be built. He was sure Mr. Turner would accept these gifts with pleasure, not on account of their money value, but of the good feelings

which had prompted his humble neighbours to offer them. He might preserve them with care, and hand them down to his children as heirlooms, as possessions of which a good man might be proud. He had already proved himself a good workman in matters commercial and political, and he would now, the subscribers felt assured, turn his hand with equal success to the work of masonry, and square and plumb the foundation-stone of their intended chapel with the accuracy of a true and accepted mason. In handing to him the insignia of office, he would further express his confidence that, both there and in the House of Parliament, Mr. Turner would be true to his principles as a Protestant Dissenter, and while jealously guarding his own religious liberty, would never enforce his own opinions, in the shape of a creed, on the conscience of any man. As a wise master-builder his work would abide; "for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus the Christ."

Mr. Turner having accepted the implements of his work, the mortar was spread, the stone was lowered, the work was tested and found to be *aplomb*. Standing on the newly-erected foundation, Mr. Turner said he was happy to address them on such an occasion, surrounded by neighbours and friends, in bright sunshine, and breathing the pure air of spring. The circumstances were very different from some others in which he had recently stood, in which the crowd was less conveniently placed, the air less pure, and the countenances of some at least not so friendly as those which he had the pleasure of seeing around him at the present moment. Whatever might be his reputation in a neighbouring city, he felt that, when standing in the neighbourhood of his own home, he could appeal to his neighbours and ask them whether he had not done what in him lay to discharge his social duties. Ever since he came to reside in the neighbourhood of Swinton, now nearly twenty years ago, he had endeavoured—as he believed to be the duty of all who were in a position a little above those by whom they were surrounded—to make his influence beneficially felt by, and his kindly feelings known to, those amongst whom he dwelt. He had endeavoured to do this to all, of every sect and party, and certainly not least towards those few who agreed with him in religious sentiments. He found a few Unitarian friends assembled in

the district, under the guidance of Mr. Boardman; they met in a small edifice, where they worshiped God and conducted a Sunday-school. He found them sometimes unsupplied with a minister to conduct their simple service; and as he happened to have in his grounds a private chapel, it occurred to him that he and his Unitarian neighbours at Swinton might advantageously unite their plans. He had therefore invited their attendance for some years at Pendlebury, where their joint worship had been offered in a spirit of Christian harmony, the school going on as usual in the building erected by Mr. Boardman. For some time he succeeded in providing them with an acceptable minister. When Mr. M'Kee removed from them to Shrewsbury, and when, soon after, the College was removed from Manchester to London, he did not find it easy to obtain the required assistance; the services at Pendlebury were for a season dropped. They were, however, resumed, in the best manner they could, at Swinton. But for some time he had resolved not to be satisfied till he could assist his neighbours in building a chapel and a school-room equal to their increasing wants. Both will be very useful here. We live in the midst of a dense population. When he first knew the district, it was very different. Now Swinton, Pendlebury and Irlam's o' the Height, had become so important, that under a new Reform Bill they might claim a Representative in Parliament. Whatever he might be able to do in effecting that end, it was quite time that Swinton had an Unitarian chapel. The new building would, he believed, be commodious and equal to the wants of the flock. He looked with great satisfaction on the prospect of their having, in addition to the chapel, a good school-room. He acknowledged the generous help given him by many friends. They were launching a little beyond their present means, but they relied on further help, and on the spirit of self-sacrifice in the people themselves. It was every man's duty to do something, in proportion to his means, in behalf of education and public worship. He was no friend to compulsory church-rates; but he liked every man, who honestly considered he belonged to a church, to do what he could to uphold it in an efficient state. He would not shrink from doing his part, and he hoped they would cheerfully do theirs. They certainly had no inten-

tion, as his good friend Mr. Boardman had hinted, of forging any theological fetters, or forcing any creed upon the people's conscience. He hoped that as Unitarians they would be faithful to the dictates of conscience, and respect others who were faithful to their light, however they might differ from them. The spirit of kindness and goodwill to all, was incumbent on every Christian. He implored his Unitarian neighbours to remember this, and to employ no force but that of argument and the example of their own Christian lives in bringing men to their way of thinking. In due time he hoped to see a minister and schoolmaster settled amongst them, and the affairs of their religious society, humble as they were, going on harmoniously and prosperously. Mr. Turner concluded an address delivered with much feeling and listened to with great attention by several hundreds of persons, by thanking the friends who had come from a distance that day to mark their sympathy with the exertions of the Unitarians of Swinton.

Rev. Dr. Beard next read two passages of Scripture. The lesson from the Old Testament, Psalm ciii., would give expression of the feelings which the founders of that chapel desired to cultivate towards God; and the lesson from the New Testament, 1 Cor. xiii., would mark those which they desired to cultivate towards their fellow-men.

Rev. J. Panton Ham then proceeded to deliver the religious address. After some appropriate introductory remarks, he proceeded in these words:

"The laying of the foundation-stone of a new Temple of Christian worship, if we contemplate its moral and spiritual uses, the influence it may be reasonably expected to exercise on the heart and life of a community, and the many sacred and endeared associations of which through a long course of time it will in all probability become the centre, ought to be regarded with the liveliest interest and emotion. No temple erected to literature or art, no hall dedicated to science, or politics, or commerce, can gather around itself such intense sympathies, and exert such a mighty influence on human character and destiny as the temple of God. Their dedication is high, and may be holy, and they may worthily take their place beside the holier temple of God, but not on the same level: the mountain of the Lord's house is higher than all the mountains of Israel. To lay the foundation-stone of this highest

x 2

and holiest of earthly temples is therefore a peculiar privilege and distinction, and on this occasion has very properly fallen to the lot of the honourable gentleman by whose active personal efforts and influence the village of Swinton is mainly indebted for, what the plans promise shall be, a simple but tasteful and commodious Christian sanctuary.

"I congratulate the inhabitants of Swinton and its neighbourhood that the new chapel, the foundation-stone of which has now been formally laid, is to be distinctively a *Unitarian* chapel. When I say a *Unitarian* chapel, I do not mean that the religious foundation of the congregation that shall worship within its walls is to be laid in any narrow sectarian spirit,—that its doctrinal basis is to be so carefully defined and fixed by the trust-deed as that the worshiper in this chapel shall find it impossible to rejoice in the liberty with which Christ has made him free. I do not mean this. The term *Unitarian*, as a theological designation, may not express the idea of full Christian freedom; but every one who knows the constitution and cherished maxims of Christian Unitarianism, will know that not only liberty of conscience, but the fullest liberty of speech and action, are mutually conceded to each other by Unitarians, and that the practical denial of this absolute freedom in any part of the Unitarian fold would be promptly repudiated as altogether foreign to the genius and usage of Unitarian Christianity. There is no other denomination in Christendom that so thoroughly respects the rights of the individual conscience, and so practically vindicates the claims of religious liberty as the Unitarian denomination. I speak as one who has been outside the pale of Unitarianism,—a minister among the descendants of the first and boldest asserters of liberty of conscience, whose denominational designation is the synonym of liberty; and even among them, the most advanced and enterprising of all the Christian sects, I found no liberty worth the name. I find it in Unitarianism, and therefore I congratulate you that a genuine Christian foundation for religious society in this neighbourhood is laid with the laying of that stone. I congratulate you that on this spot a temple is about to arise where you will be able to enjoy as much Christian freedom as your intelligence and conscience may demand, and the extent of your personal religious culture may permit,—that neither the

doctrinal basis nor the public ministry of your new chapel will present any obstacle, but on the contrary will afford every encouragement, to the fullest enjoyment of the right of private judgment, and the fullest expression of a courteous and consistent Christian liberty.

“When I say, therefore, that I congratulate you that a distinctively *Unitarian* chapel is about to be erected in your neighbourhood, I mean that, because it is Unitarian, you have the guarantee of true Christian liberty. I claim not more than is just in behalf of Unitarianism, when I say that it is the charter, and the only genuine charter, of civil and religious liberty. But this is not all. I mean also that the congregation or society which shall hereafter worship on this spot, will stand upon the true foundation of a Christian church. ‘Other foundation,’ says St. Paul, ‘can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.’ Jesus Christ will be the one sole foundation of your Christian faith and action. On him, I trust, many will here be built up a spiritual and immortal temple to the glory of God and His grace. The God to whose glory this house is to be built, and who, it is devoutly trusted, will be ever revealed therein in an intelligent, faithful and earnest ministry, is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,—the God, the attributes of whose character were reflected in the spirit and life of Jesus, who is ‘the Image of the invisible God,’ ‘the express Image of his Person,’—the God who, when the ancient Lawgiver of the Hebrews said to Him, ‘Shew me thy glory,’ replied, ‘I will make all my goodness pass before thee,’—the God who is the *Good One*, whose ‘glory’ is His ‘goodness,’—the beneficent Father and Friend of all men, who ‘delighteth not in the death of a sinner, but would rather that he should turn unto Him and live.’ This is the God of whom Jesus Christ was the human Representative, and whom he revealed in his discourses, and still more eloquently and fully in his own individual spirit and life. Your faith lies, therefore, in few words. ‘To us,’ you say with the apostle, ‘there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.’ I congratulate you that this chapel is to be called Unitarian, because this name promises that it will be opened in the faith, and I trust will never re-

linquish the faith, of the possibility of the spiritual education, progressiveness and perfectibility of the human race. I rejoice that this holy house is to be built and used by those Christian disciples who hold it to be blasphemy both against man and his Maker to deny him any element of natural goodness, and to pronounce him by the constitution of his nature a moral ruin,—from his birth under the frown and curse of God, incapable of a single holy thought or feeling, responding to none of the thousand influences by which he is surrounded, and which incessantly appeal to his conscience and heart for his education in righteousness and true holiness;—I rejoice, I say, that those Christians have put their hands to this work, and will sustain it, who think better of humanity and of the God of humanity than this,—who enter on this godly enterprize with a more cheerful and hopeful, and, I may add, more reasonable and Christian and scriptural faith,—and who firmly believe, and will work in the inspiration of the belief, that human nature is capable of religious as well as of every other kind of education; that the religious faculty, above all, is not the only faculty that lies dormant and dead in the human soul; that it may be hopefully appealed to under all, even the most degraded, conditions; and that pre-eminently the spirit and life of Jesus Christ, to whom this house is to be dedicated to the glory of God the Father, contain the all-sufficient elements of spiritual power and appeal, inasmuch as he is ‘made unto us of God, wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption.’

“Without being more particular, I congratulate you, in brief, that a more efficient and permanent ministration of Christian truth is about to be established in this neighbourhood by the erection of a new place of Unitarian Christian worship. I trust that the benevolent intentions of those to whom you are under obligations for your new sanctuary will be realized,—that here a sphere of labour shall be found for an intelligent and earnest Christian minister, by whose agency your children shall be educated in knowledge and virtue, and, with yourselves, be aided in that onward and upward course that leads to life.

“In conclusion, let me add, while looking forward to what this house is to be, and, by the blessing of God, will accomplish, that a time is coming when

it will have fulfilled its destiny, and, like all the perishable things of earth, will be no more. But if here souls shall have been renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, it will exist for ever in the sacred memories and imperishable affections of such as have here been 'born again,' and have 'passed from death unto life,' and therefore what has been done to-day has high and holy significance, and even immortal issues. This temple of earth will be the means, I trust, of rearing up many a heavenly temple to perpetuate its everlasting remembrance, and immortalize the day and the beneficence that gave it existence. 'Temples hewn from the rock,' writes Channing, 'will crumble to dust, or melt in the last fire. But the inward temple will survive all outward change. When winds, and oceans, and suns, shall have ceased to praise God, the human soul will praise him. It will receive more and more divine inspirations of truth and love; will fill with its benevolent ministry wider and wider spheres; and will accomplish its destiny by a progress towards God as unlimited, as mysterious, as enduring as eternity.'"

At the close of the address, an earnest Christian prayer was offered by the Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton, and a benediction was given by Rev. R. B. Aspland, of Dukinfield. The friends then returned to the school-room, in which, and in the house of Mr. Boardman, a social meal was enjoyed. When tea was over, as many of the friends assembled as the room would hold, and formed a public meeting, under the presidency of Mr. W. Boardman.

Dr. Beard assured the meeting of sympathy with the good cause at Swinton in Manchester, with both ministers and laity, and earnestly advised the people to depend on themselves, and to be prepared to make sacrifices for the purpose of obtaining the services of a devoted minister in their future chapel.

J. A. Turner, Esq., M.P., described how the scheme for the chapel had grown and grown. The highest sum proposed at first was £400; then, finding it possible to attain that, he had suggested £600; and then, on approaching £600, he had altered the amount to £800. Not considering it reverent or decent to have the bustle of a school, public meetings, tea-drinkings, &c., in a place of worship, he had assisted them in the project of having a school-room nearly as large as the chapel, and so they should need £200 or £300 more.

Mr. T. concluded by appealing to the people now to depend upon themselves to secure the services of a minister, and not leave it to enemies to say the erection of a Unitarian chapel in Swinton was a mistake. But they must not only depend on themselves to support a minister; they must win regard for their religion among the population by shewing its influence upon their lives.

Mr. T. Baker proposed a vote of thanks to the Rev. J. P. Ham and the other ministers who had given their services that afternoon.

Rev. J. P. Ham looked forward with great anxiety to the future prospects of the congregation at Swinton. There would be a Catholic chapel and Catholic priest at Swinton; and the latter would do his work, bringing persons to Catholicism, though there might be no Unitarian minister to bring persons to a purer and freer faith. Now let them contrast Catholicism with Unitarianism, and remember that one was the antipodes of the other, and they would have reasons for bestirring themselves.

Rev. T. E. Poynting was glad to see a Christian temple of any denomination rising, but more especially one consecrated to Unitarian Christianity, because that was consecrated not only to faith, but to freedom. And without freedom—freedom to trust the reason and conscience which God placed in our minds—faith in these days was well-nigh impossible; but we must value our freedom for the sake of our faith; for freedom without faith became only licentiousness, and degenerated into Deism, Atheism, Secularism, Materialism, Pantheism, and all kinds of unbelief,—as faith without freedom degenerated into superstition.

Edward Shawcross, Esq., expressed his satisfaction that there would be a school in connection with the chapel, and hoped it would raise up future worshippers for the congregation.

Mr. Robinson moved a vote of thanks to those who had so long worked in the school, which was acknowledged by Mr. Jackson.

THE CHURCH OF THE DIVINE UNITY,
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

The services in celebration of the third anniversary of the opening of this church and school-rooms began on Good Friday morning, April 10. The Rev. George Harris conducted the introductory worship, and the sermon, an unanswerable exposure of religious

error, a luminous and scriptural exhibition of Christian truth, was preached by the Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., of Manchester; the subject, the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Easter Sunday morning, April 12, the whole service was undertaken by Mr. Gaskell; the sermon a masterly vindication and assertion of the reasonableness, scripturality, moral power, benevolent and hallowing influences of Unitarian Christianity. In the evening, the Rev. John Wright, B.A., of Bury, prayed and preached,—shewing the superior tendency of the principles of Christian Unitarianism to induce philanthropic labours, efforts in every direction to uplift humanity, and ensure human freedom, purity, peace and blessedness. In addition to these labours in Newcastle on Sunday, Mr. Wright and Mr. Gaskell preached in Sunderland on the same day, the one in the morning, the other in the evening; both kindly concurring in the wishes expressed by Mr. Harris and Newcastle friends, that the earnest and indefatigable efforts of the Rev. Robert Spears and the Sunderland brethren should be aided and strengthened by their presence and advocacy. The audiences in each town were highly encouraging, numerous and most attentive.

Monday afternoon, April 13, the day of the month on which, in 1854, the new buildings were opened, a social gathering of the members and friends of the Newcastle congregation took place in the school-rooms. They were crowded, upwards of five hundred persons being present. After inspecting the various objects of interest that had been collected for instruction and gratification—partaking of tea and coffee, with their accompaniments, provided in abundance by several ladies of the congregation—mutual introductions of friends from a distance,—adjournment to the church took place, the large assembly being presided over by the Rev. Geo. Harris. A hymn of thanksgiving was joined in heartily by all present. The Chairman congratulated the congregation on the accomplishment of their long-cherished and hard-struggled-for objects, the church and schools, which had cost £5400, being now free. Thanking friends from a distance, and others of various communions residents in Newcastle, for coming to rejoice with them in their joy,—and delineating the principles of faith, hope and charity, which the Unitarian Christian cherished and advocated,—

proffering the right hand of fellowship to all who feared God and worked righteousness,—he concluded by proposing, “Increasing success to the Church of the Divine Unity.” The choir sang, “Lift up your heads, ye everlasting doors.” Ivie Mackie, Esq., of Manchester, who laid the foundation-stone of the buildings, was then heartily welcomed, and gave as hearty response. Cordial thanks to the Rev. W. Gaskell for his services, produced a most animated and spirit-stirring rejoinder, justifying Unitarian Christianity in its negations of error, no less than its positive assertions of divine truth, freedom and holiness; rebuking the vain and dastardly fears of the timid, worldly and lukewarm; cheering onward the upright, the morally honest and brave. Dr. Hayle proposed a resolution of welcome to the Rev. John Wright on this his first visit to Newcastle, coupled with warmest acknowledgments for his services. Put to the meeting with additional remarks by Mr. Harris, the greeting to Mr. Wright was no less cordial than merited. And his reply was full of earnest and practical suggestion, inspiring hope and trust in the future progress of divine truth. The Rev. H. V. Palmer, of York, spoke well on “The Memory of our sainted Fathers, the old Nonconformists to religious error,” and traced with accuracy and power the progress of the Christian church through its ages of corruption and reformation. “Our Brethren of all religious denominations,” was the closing sentiment, proposed by the Chairman. Earnest thanks to the ladies for their kind aid in this Christian festival, evinced the gratitude of the assembly for their assistance to its success and delight. Mr. Gaskell moving, and Mr. James Clephan seconding, grateful acknowledgments to Mr. Harris for his presidency, as well as offering congratulations on the triumph over all obstacles which had been achieved through his persevering energy, drew from Mr. Harris expressions of unabated hopes of still greater triumphs over ignorance, error, superstition and sin, awaiting the zealous, combined, God-fearing efforts of conscientious, faithful, Christ-constraining disciples of truth and freedom and goodness. “Give peace most pure, O Lord,” “Sound the loud trumpet,” “Hear my prayer,” “O, rest in the Lord,” and the “Hallelujah Chorus,” were accurately and beautifully sung in the course of the evening, diversifying and deepening the effect

of the addresses. This happy, successful and rejoicing assembly closed with the Lord's Prayer and benediction by the Chairman.

Tuesday afternoon, April 14, the children and teachers of the schools, day and Sunday, assembled in the school-rooms; and after partaking of tea, were addressed by the Revds. Geo. Harris and John Wright; Mr. W. Ellis, teacher of the boys' day-school, on behalf of himself and Miss Walker, the teacher of the girls' day-school; the Rev. H. V. Palmer; Mr. Oliver, formerly a scholar in Hanover-Square chapel schools, now teacher in Birmingham; and Mr. Hornsby. Wednesday evening, April 15, Mr. Wright preached to a large audience at Eighton Banks, in the Cottage chapel, one of the missionary stations of the North-of-England Unitarian Christian Association. And on Thursday, April 16, Mr. Wright visited the friends at Alnwick, enjoying their converse amidst the glorious and diversified scenery of the lovely park of its Castle. The remembrance of the Easter of 1857 will ever be green in the minds and hearts of those who engaged in its religious celebration, mingled with thankfulness to those who added by their presence and services to its instruction and enjoyment.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN FUND SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society was held at the Unitarian chapel, Baffin's Lane, Chichester, on Good Friday, April 10th. The Rev. E. Kell conducted the devotional service in the morning, and the Rev. E. Talbot gave in a lucid and impressive form a statement of the leading views of Unitarians, and their position with regard to other sects, taking his text from 2 Cor. x. 7. In the evening, the Rev. H. Hawkes introduced the service, and the Rev. E. Talbot delivered an able and appropriate discourse from John xvii. 3, shewing that scriptural Unitarianism, when appreciated and realized, is superior to modern Orthodoxy as a moral and spiritual influence.—At the business meeting of the Society, after the morning service, Richard Lacy, Esq., in the chair, the Rev. E. Kell read the Report of the Society, which contained communications from the various congregations in the district. In the report from Portsmouth, it was stated that a course of doctrinal lectures had been delivered at the High-Street

chapel by various ministers from London and the surrounding district, under the superintendence of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society, which had been attended by large audiences. During their delivery many thousand tracts had been distributed, furnished by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association and the Southern Unitarian Society, and considerable interest had been excited for the cause of religious truth. The Report closes as follows:

"Such, brethren and friends, are the reports from our churches for the past year. They are not perhaps calculated (except that from Portsmouth, in which the lectures towards which your Society's funds have been mainly devoted with much and gratifying success) to excite sanguine expectations of the rapid spread of our pure and holy faith. But let us remember that it is the darkest hour precedes the bright dawn of day; that it was the Cross of Calvary, and the sorrows and sadness of the first disciples, which preceded the glorious resurrection of Him who is the High-priest of our profession. And we, the followers of the Crucified, have no right to expect that present gladness, present victory, shall attend our every effort.

'We must not seek a resting-place,
Where HE we love had none!'

And though Jehovah's ways are oft-times hidden from us—though His path is in the deep waters, and His footsteps are not seen, yet we may—yea, we will, go on hopefully, because the cause of holy truth is upheld by His omnipotent arm.

"But, brethren, though we have no room for despondency, we have room for sorrow—sorrow that *we* have not been more zealous, more earnest, more devoted; that we have been so often faint-hearted and distrustful. We cannot control results, nor need we nor ought we to fear them. Let us fear only our own supineness, our own infidelity to gospel light and gospel purity, and resolve that we will secure for ourselves *that* testimony which shall be of more value to us than the world's applause,—the approving voice of our ascended Saviour,—his thrilling words, 'Ye are they who have continued faithful to me.'"

The Report having been adopted on the motion of Mr. Molesworth, seconded by Mr. Sawyer, and the best thanks of the meeting having been presented to the Preacher on the motion of the Rev. H. Hawkes, seconded by Rev. J.

Fullagar, the latter gentleman moved that a Petition be presented to Parliament for the eligibility of Jews to sit in the House of Commons, which, on being seconded by Rev. E. Talbot, was adopted by the meeting. The Rev. J. Fullagar also proposed a Petition to the House of Commons for the Revision of the Scriptures by public authority, which was seconded by the Rev. E. Kell and unanimously carried. Other resolutions of a routine character were proposed by the Rev. T. Foster and Messrs. Redwards, Sothcote and Wm. Blessly, of Portsmouth. Between the services, about forty of the members and friends of the Society dined together, under the able presidency of the Rev. J. Fullagar, when various sentiments on the great topics of religious liberty, truth and righteousness, were responded to by the gentlemen above mentioned, and the afternoon was passed with much harmony and edification.

E. KELL.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

A special meeting of the Trustees was held in the Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, on Thursday, April 16. Our readers have seen the "Protest" of certain Trustees against the proceedings of the Committee, and the "Special Report" of that body. Here it was supposed the matter would rest; but at the meeting of the Committee held April 3rd, a letter was read, addressed by Rev. James Martineau to the Chairman of the Committee, rehearsing the facts of his and Mr. Tayler's appointment to the two chairs and their acceptance of them; the subsequent receipt of the Protest, "in which 70 Trustees disavow or withdraw the confidence which the annual meeting had reposed in the Committee," and in which, he adds, that "they express distrust in the Professors as religious teachers, and insist that security ought to have been taken for the inculcation of certain unspecified doctrinal opinions." Mr. Martineau proceeds in his letter to complain that this Protest had been acknowledged by the Committee and entered upon their minutes; and says that the Professors could not be expected to be insensible to what the Committee had received and put on record against them,—that the existence of no direct vote of the Trustees in favour of the Professors, as a counterpoise against the Protest, placed the Committee and himself in a false position. He on these

grounds requested the Committee to convene a special meeting of Trustees, or "to relieve him of a task which had lost its conditions of security and success." As the College Committee have been strangely censured for their recognition of the Protest, we venture in passing to remark, that they were induced to act as they did in receiving the Protest by a spirit of courteous deference to a number of gentlemen, many of whom they knew to be old and earnest friends of the College. If their record of the Protest was irregular, their motive in receiving it was much to their credit; and it is only by the manifestation of such a spirit that harmony can be preserved in or restored to an institution depending on the goodwill of a large body of supporters. It is a sorry technicality to assert that the Protest becomes important by being recorded in the minutes of Committee. Its importance lay in its being the deliberate expression of opinion of certain Trustees, and this would have remained had the Committee thought proper to refuse to notice the document in any way.—The Committee, thus appealed to by Mr. Martineau, could do nothing else than summon the Trustees to express an opinion on their Special Report. An active canvass for attendance and votes was carried on by the friends of the Professors, and, through an advertisement in the columns of the *Inquirer*, a circular and other channels, earnest appeals were made to the Trustees to uphold the Committee and their chosen Professors, and to put down the Protesters, who were freely charged with theological odium, persecution, and an intention of invading the precious rights of religious liberty. The Protesters, on the other hand, having abandoned all hope of an immediate change in the College arrangements, made no canvass nor appeal, but were contented with the knowledge that it was the intention of some of their number to attend the meeting and maintain the ground occupied by the Protest. The assembly of Trustees was, notwithstanding the absence of more than fifty of those who had signed the Protest, large beyond all precedent in the history of the College. *One hundred and forty-one* Trustees were assembled in the course of the day. We can of course only mention the names of some. Amongst the 107 laymen who, we believe, attended, were Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., Mr. Thomas Thornely, M.P., Mr. W. R. Wood, Mr. George Long,

Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. Walter Coffin, Mr. Meade King, Mr. Robert H. Greg, Mr. R. Philips Greg, Mr. Ainsworth, of Cleator, Mr. Walter Bagehot, Mr. R. N. Philips, Mr. Thomas Bolton, Mr. Charles Booth, Mr. Eddowes Bowman, Mr. William Blake, Mr. Courtauld, Mr. Henry Coppock, Mr. John Grundy, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. Leyson Lewis, Mr. Henry Long, Mr. John Long, Mr. H. C. Robinson, Mr. W. Rathbone, Mr. Addyes Scott, Mr. Sam. Thornely, Mr. Thos. Wrigley, Mr. Robt. Worthington. Amongst the 34 ministers who attended, were Rev. Chas. Wicksteed, Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. F. Baker, Rev. Edward Tagart, Rev. S. Bache, Rev. W. H. Channing, Rev. John Kenrick, Rev. W. Gaskell, Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. Edmund Kell, Rev. Benjamin Mardon, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. James Whitehead, &c. &c. Mr. Meade King was, in the absence of the President, called to the chair. A considerable number of letters from various parts of the kingdom were read, most of them expressing approbation of the proceedings of the Committee. A letter from Mr. Darnton Lupton, of Leeds, stated that all the Leeds Trustees withdrew their Protest, though retaining their reasons. A letter from Rev. W. A. Jones stated that he withdrew his Protest. Rev. Edward Talbot verbally withdrew his name from the Protest.*

A long and very irregular discussion arose on the reading of a letter from Mr. H. W. Busk, claiming to exercise the right of voting by proxy, and stating that the proceedings of the Committee were void, because such a change as they contemplated making in the arrangement of the College could only originate in a general meeting of Trustees, and required the assent of two-thirds of that body. On the other side it was argued, that these regulations, though part of the constitution of the Warrington Academy, had never been admitted into the constitution of Manchester College; and Mr. E. W.

Field stated that it had been laid down by Lord Hardwicke, that Trustees could not perform their duty by proxy, but must always give personal attendance when acting as Trustees. In the course of this discussion, Mr. Coppock, Mr. S. D. Darbishire, Mr. Smale and others, took part. Reference was made to the original minute-book and laws of Manchester College, and decision given against Mr. Busk's application.

Mr. MARK PHILIPS then rose and said that it would be in their remembrance that at the annual meeting of Trustees held in that place on January 22, he had moved a resolution, instructing the Committee "to take into consideration the practicability of providing for the theological and philosophical instruction of the students of Manchester New College by a re-distribution of work between the Principal and the Rev. James Martineau, without the appointment of a third Professor." On that resolution an amendment was proposed. The resolution and the amendment were, after discussion, both withdrawn; the Committee was appointed, and the whole question was left in their hands. It was therefore his hope that whatever the decision of the Committee might be, it would be satisfactory to the Trustees at large. He regretted that this was not the case. In a constitutional point of view, it appeared to him that the Committee had simply discharged the duty imposed upon them. They were the representatives of the Trustees, and the conclusion they arrived at was virtually the decision of the Trustees. He did, therefore, read with very great regret the Protest, differing so widely from the decision of the Committee. He was not surprised at the course which Mr. Martineau had thought fit to adopt. He (Mr. P.) did not at that moment know what the exact points of difference were which had led some of their friends to take a different course. But it struck him that they were on the verge of an estrangement from their principles. If the decision of the Committee was to be questioned and made matter of excitement and irritation, there was only one course to pursue, viz., to take a vote of confidence. It was due to the Trustees that there should be an expression of opinion whether the course pursued by the Committee were approved by the majority of the Trustees. Mr. Martineau had been placed in a most unenviable position. He had made arrangements (in themselves no

* It may be as well to state that the names of Mr. Jones and Mr. Talbot did not appear in the Protest as advertised in the Christian Reformer. The names of Mr. John Hart, of London, Mr. Rankin, of Bristol, and Mr. Samuel Grundy, should be added to the Protest. If the names of the five Leeds gentlemen and Mr. J. C. Lawrence, who voted with the majority at the special meeting of Trustees, be withdrawn, there remain attached to the Protest the names of 62 Trustees.

doubt very painful) to withdraw from his congregation. He had also disposed of his house. Under the serious circumstances in which he was placed, he had acted quite right in making this appeal to the Trustees. He hoped the meeting that day would place that gentleman's mind at ease; that the Trustees would in the first instance express their confidence in the Committee, and that they would do the same with regard to the two Professors. He hoped they would avoid anything like dictation in matters of conscience. They were descendants of men who had made great sacrifices for freedom of conscience. Nothing, he trusted, would take place that day that would interfere with this freedom. While mistrusting the mode pursued by the Protesters, he did not censure their motives. He entreated them to pause, lest they should interfere with the first principles of religious freedom. He might not himself agree with the opinions of Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau; but it was his bounden duty not to let his feelings override his judgment, however strongly he might wish to have one particular school more prominent than another. They might sometimes diverge in their views, at other times they might come together; but they should not let anything interfere with the freedom of either party. The Committee, he believed, had endeavoured to discharge their duty. He wished the Trustees to uphold the acts of the Committee, and to assure the Professors that they had the general confidence of the body. The eyes of the world were upon them. There were many who secretly wished to be in the free attitude of the Unitarians—a reflecting and thinking set of men, who would not lightly swerve from their cherished principles. He would therefore conclude by moving the following resolution: "That this meeting, having received the Special Report of the Committee, dated 12th of March last, as to the measures adopted by them in relation to the Professorial arrangement of the College, testifies its unabated confidence in the Committee and its full acceptance of those measures, and hereby formally adopts the Report."

The Rev. J. H. THOM seconded the resolution in a long and very eloquent speech, to which we fear we cannot do justice in the report we have the means of giving. By the constitution and practice of the College, all appointments rested with the Committee.

When, therefore, a vacancy in the Chair of Theology took place, they appointed a Special Committee to consider and report the best course. After a period of six months they had made no report and offered no suggestion. In that condition of circumstances, held three months ago, it was thought right to throw out a hint to the Committee as to their procedure, and a resolution was proposed instructing the Committee to re-distribute the duties between the two Professors remaining. This was met by an amendment, proposing that the Trustees should appoint a Special Committee. The matter was debated for four mortal hours, with, as far as he could judge, a decided leaning of the Trustees to the resolution. But when the question was ripe for decision, some indiscreet friends of peace got up and asked for an "unanimity resolution," i.e. for a resolution that, by shrinking from a decision, leaves the difficulty for decision elsewhere. To those advisers they were indebted for all that conflict and the trouble of that meeting. He should, under the circumstances, have felt debarred in honour from protesting against an exercise of discretion which he had himself confided to the Committee. The Trustees declined to give instructions to the Committee; now the Protesters seek to invalidate engagements made in the exercise of an authority which the constitution of the College gave to the Committee. He denied the right of any not members of the Committee to *protest*. Five members of the Committee had brought in sixty-five Trustees to aid them. Irregular as this was, a still greater irregularity was practised by the Committee in admitting the Protest to a place on their minutes. Mr. Thom then went into an examination of the matters contained in the Protest. As to the first charge of haste, time was pressing, and there was in reality no other plan than that of re-distribution to consider. As to the second charge, that the Hebrew was not to be taught by the Professor of Theology, he thought that an advantage. The same man should not teach a language and interpret the book written in that language. The Professor of Theology was by this arrangement kept in check; he was not able to load the dice with which he was to play the game. It was a strange argument against a scheme that it made a staff of teachers more special and perfect. The third

objection was to the division of the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion between two Professors. It was in fact a recommendation. If there were two branches of evidence, one proper to Nature, the other to Revelation,—the science of human nature, it was proper, should not be under the dictation of revealed truth. Had he been the Professor of Moral Philosophy for seventeen years, as Mr. Martineau had been, he would long ago have claimed and insisted upon having this department of his science. The other part of the charge, that the teaching of the two Professors would not secure general confidence, who could meet so vague a charge? He had to find both the dream and the interpretation of the dream. There were two kinds of evidence, external and internal,—that which deals with external facts, and that which treats of internal faculties. Many men were qualified to treat of the first, who were incapable of the second. Few who were capable of grappling with the second but would be equal to the first. They well knew that Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau possessed in no common degree the power of dealing with the philosophical side of the question; what possible ground could there be for saying they were not qualified to deal with the historical side? Nowhere are to be found men more filled with faith in God and faith in a personal Christ. The fourth objection in the Protest relates to the salaries offered. The first duty the Committee had to perform was to find a competent staff of Professors, and having done that, to see that they were not overpaid. It was in no generous spirit that the Protesters, whether lay or clerical, grudged the salaries which would be so honourably earned by the distinguished men appointed to the two Chairs. But the sting of the Protest was in its tail, the fifth objection,—that the two Professors belonged to one school of religious thought, and in consequence views deemed by many of the Trustees essential to Christian truth would be shut out from a fair representation in the Professorial instruction. If this be so, there is an *orthodoxy* and the contrary in our religious body, and one part of our body separates itself from the other. Where, then, was their common Christianity—where their boasted fellowship of heart and creed? He would not press this point, because he honestly hoped it was an

ill-advised expression, and did not do justice to the Protesters themselves. Either they wish that certain doctrines of their own shall be inculcated, or they distrust the ability and candour and fairness of the Professors to deal with their subjects. He would not press the first against the Protesters. As to the second, Mr. Martineau and Mr. Tayler are so one-sided and unfair, that they would not truly represent the body of old Unitarianism. This imputation was singularly irrelevant. If it were a qualification for understanding a phase of religious thought that it was once your own, and that it included the whole of your religious belief, then Mr. Martineau was particularly qualified to expound the views of the Protesters. When he first knew Mr. Martineau, he was an Unitarian of the old school, a Hartleyan and a Necessarian; and in the first edition of his *Rationale* he held that there was no conceivable sense in which a man could be called a Christian who did not believe in the miracles. No man, he supposed, attributed to Mr. Martineau want of perfect honesty. He had perhaps sometimes given a sharp expression to his opinions, not as a Professor, but as a preacher. This was right. It was the business of the prophet to represent himself; it is the business of the Professor to represent fairly and fully the opinions of other men. It was singularly unfair to apply to Mr. Martineau, in his character of Professor, objections drawn from his practice as a preacher. He asked the Protesters to tell the meeting what were the views essential to Christian truth which the Professors did not hold. Three months ago he went through the painful task of giving a testimonial to Mr. Martineau's fitness for a Chair of Theology. With regard to all the principles of biblical criticism—with regard to the authority of Scripture—with regard to the miracles of the New Testament, he holds precisely the same principles which they all held in common. The Protesters would perhaps say they were not responsible for that meeting. They could not, however, blame Mr. Martineau for attaching weight to their expressed want of confidence. He feels he is not able to go on without knowing that he has the willing support of the Trustees. His conduct shews what importance he would attach to their confidence, if so fortunate as to receive it. He (Mr. Thom) confessed his difficulty

in dealing with this occasion. He was unwilling to believe that they were in danger of acting from theological prejudice. He wanted not to use language too large for the occasion. He was unwilling to use arguments which could not without insult be used, except to a conclave of inquisitors. He would not believe that the traditions of the past had become mere traditions. He would not believe that a meeting of English Presbyterians were in danger of doing an injury, on account of supposed theological differences, to men whose genius would have won them renown in any other walk of life. If he did believe this, he would use a tone of expostulation that under the circumstances would be unjust to the gentlemen before him. He would not believe that Unitarians form no exception to the rule, that every sect has persecuted and cast out its best men; that the measure of liberty they were willing to grant to others was just the measure of their own footsteps, or rather the measure of the footsteps of some dead prophet, while they sacrificed the living prophet. He felt, as a Liverpool man, that he was speaking against himself. They of Liverpool would be glad to keep him whom they rejected. There were no Liverpool names attached to that Protest. He saw many Liverpool gentlemen around him at that moment who would be sorely tempted to be guilty of a dereliction of principle, if by so acting they could keep Mr. Martineau amongst them. But things had come to that pass that they could not keep him without the Trustees of the College being dishonoured. Nothing would be further from his wishes than to appeal from divines to laymen. His sympathies were with his order. He was sure there were many laymen present who were totally indifferent to these theological disputes; who had no notion of walking to heaven over a bridge as fine as a razor; who thoroughly knew their special duty as the guardians of religious liberty; who were resolved that eminent men devoted to their service should at their hands suffer no pains and penalties. He had therefore no apprehension whatever but that their vote that day would be in accordance with freedom and progress.

Mr. GEORGE LONG felt that in rising to move an amendment, after the very eloquent address to which they had listened with so much admiration, he had undertaken a task beyond his

powers. In the course of that address, some hard, but he could not but think unjust, charges had been brought against the gentlemen who joined in the Protest. It was alleged that none but members of the Committee should have signed that document. He would admit that his first impression was one of that kind; but on reflection it appeared to him that, joining in the opinions of those who in committee had opposed the proceedings of their colleagues, he ought not to shrink from the responsibility of supporting them. The right of protesting was enjoyed by the highest legislative body in the kingdom, and ought not to be refused to those who wished to absolve themselves from the responsibility of acts they disapproved. When the Committee issued recently their circular calling that meeting, it was felt that an opportunity was given for reconsidering the whole subject. The matter had been carefully considered by a number of the London Trustees, who had recently met at his house, and who had done him the honour to depute him to come down as their representative, and to ask the Trustees to pass a resolution enabling the Committee to consult the wishes of every individual Trustee as to the recent appointments. The resolution which he should move as an amendment was not one of at all an extreme or revolutionary complexion. It was simply declaring that, on a matter so important to all the Trustees, all should have the opportunity of calmly pronouncing a verdict. Much of the eloquent speech just addressed to them had little to do with the real matter in hand. If a stranger, not knowing what they were assembled about, had come in at the beginning of that remarkable address,—if he had been moved by the eloquent appeal with which it concluded, he never could have imagined that it was occasioned by the simple business actually before them. (Here and throughout most of the speeches that followed there was loud interruption, frequently renewed, which made it difficult to catch the speaker's words, and must have greatly embarrassed those speaking.) The simple matter before them was, would they adopt the Report of the Committee, or would they take another course? If they would listen to his counsel, they would try the healing influence of another course. It seemed to be the prevailing doctrine that the appointment of the Professors must rest exclusively with

the Committee. He could not believe this. He saw, indeed, in the notice of summons, that the object of the meeting was limited to one single narrow point. It was idle for the Trustees to meet if they could do no more than register the decrees of the Committee. He must on broad principles object to a comparatively small number of Trustees having to decide on questions of such great importance, affecting not merely the Institution, but the religious body for which it aimed to train proper ministers. It was so important an issue that had to be tried, that the whole of the Trustees should be consulted individually. As to the reduction of the staff of Theological Professors from three to two, he must express his doubts, if not his dissent. They ought to hesitate before they finally parted with their third Professor. He for one could not but think that the existing distribution was on the whole better than that proposed to be carried out. He might indeed not disagree with some of Mr. Thom's remarks on the connection between moral philosophy and the evidences of natural religion. But from some of his remarks about instruction in the historical evidences of Christianity he did dissent. He was unwilling to let it go forth that it was a very cunning and laborious thing to give a man a firm belief in Christianity. To go to that which was the most difficult and painful part of the subject before them. Most glad would he be could he with propriety abstain from casting any the slightest censure on the two gentlemen who had been appointed by the Committee. He knew both of them, and with one of them he had had the pleasure of very friendly relations. They must, however, put aside all personal predilections, for they were called upon to decide whether or not these gentlemen are the best persons that we can select to instruct our youth in theology and prepare them for our pulpits. There could not be a more important purpose. Ought they to confide the whole theological instruction of our students preparing for the ministry to Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau? He was compelled, from his knowledge of those gentlemen's views, to say that they ought not. He wished to fetter no man in his inquiries into the truths of religion. He would condemn no man for differing, however widely, from himself. But this was a very different thing from approving of this man or that as

the best theological instructor. He could not believe that these gentlemen were alone the best instructors of youth. He thought they wanted the help of men of a different stamp. Some of the opinions advanced in the writings of the two Professors were not of a character to promote religion or increase the influence of Christianity in the world. The obscure and mystical style in which they were accustomed to clothe their ideas did, in his view, constitute a serious objection to them as teachers and models to the young. It is said by their admirers that they agree with Dr. Channing. The works of Dr. Channing he read with delight. Of all Unitarian writings, his appeared to him to be the most powerful, instructive and plain. But if he were asked if there were any resemblance between the writings of Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau and those of Dr. Channing, he must answer that he could discover none. The very character of mind in the two Professors indisposed them, he feared, to one branch of Christian instruction. Their zeal for spiritual Christianity made them indifferent to, disposed them to disparage, the historical evidences. If he alone took the objections he had stated, he might set down something to his own want of discernment; but he found similar objections in the minds of many Unitarians; he believed they prevailed very widely. In order to test the opinion of the Trustees, he would move an amendment on the resolution, to the effect that the Committee be instructed to take steps to ascertain by circular the wishes of every individual Trustee.

Mr. E. BOWMAN seconded the amendment; opposing the adoption of the Special Report, on the ground that it did not give that "accurate statement of the Committee's proceedings and of the position of affairs" which the Circular of the 4th of March had entitled the Trustees to expect. That the appended Extracts from the Minutes were undeserving of confidence, he shewed by pointing out a number of important minutes, all referring to the new arrangements, and which had nevertheless been entirely omitted from the "Extracts." He next complained of the erroneous impression conveyed by the Special Report itself. The appointment of Mr. Martineau as full Professor, which was there assumed to have been only recently contemplated, as the sole means of extrication from our difficulties, had, in fact, been designed and attempted so far back

as 1853; * first, by endeavouring to add a full Professorship of Philosophy to the existing Theological provision; which failed;—secondly, by displacing one of the two Theological Professors; which, though at first carried by a surprise, was soon reversed by an “overwhelming majority” on a motion by Mr. Kenrick; † thirdly, by raising a special subscription, which was partially successful. ‡ He then stated how, in the spring of last year, a dispute in one of the classes had been made the occasion of a new movement against the Theological Professor; had been referred to the theological officers of the College, and was being brought by them to an amicable solution, when it was suddenly taken out of their hands, and the solution (which would have restored harmony and thus avoided our present difficulties) presented by the same gentleman who was foremost in the attempt of 1853. He related how the Professor (who, whatever his deficiencies may have been, was supported by the concurrent testimony of our most eminent divines) had been driven to resign, and how the first practicable opportunity had been taken to refuse the re-appointment of the usual Sub-committee for providing a successor, and announce the scheme of re-distributing the work between the two remaining Professors. He concluded by shewing that the reduction of the Professorial staff from three to two, by which the teaching power of the College would be permanently diminished, and the Chair of Critical and Exegetical Theology, as a distinct Professorship, suppressed, was a measure justifiable only by the strongest necessity; that no such necessity had been shewn, or existed; and that the plea of financial deficiencies, on which a change so momentous had been urged and carried in the Committee, was completely groundless, and ignored even by its authors as soon as it had attained its purpose. And in going over these transactions, which he did amidst considerable interruptions, he contended that they were only explicable on the supposition of a long-cherished desire on the part of Mr. Martineau's friends to obtain for him a full Professorship in London; and that the Protesters were justified in opposing the new arrangements, and ascertaining the feeling of the whole body of Trustees, in the manner proposed in the amendment.

Mr. Bowman spoke amidst repeated interruptions, and at the close of his speech there were loud calls for a division.

Mr. S. D. DARBISHIRE said that the hypothesis on which Mr. Bowman rested his remarks had no existence whatever except in his own imagination.

Rev. CHARLES BEARD after much difficulty obtained a hearing, and replied in great detail to Mr. Bowman, defending the Committee and the officers of the College. He argued that the Protest was unconstitutional, and was, moreover, ill-timed. The proposal contained in the amendment was singularly unhappy. They were asked to abdicate their powers as a collective representation of the Trustees. Never had such a meeting of the Trustees as the present been held. There were gentlemen present from all parts of England, including places at the greatest distance. As to the allegation that Mr. Martineau was not a believer in the historical evidences, he was prepared to meet that theological statement with a direct theological denial. In a letter he had that day received from Mr. Martineau, he was authorized by him to say that, should it be asserted that he was an anti-supernaturalist, the assertion was untrue. As to the objection taken by one of the speakers to Mr. Martineau's style, it was an undeniable fact that he was the man who, more than any living writer, exercised influence on the free theology of his age and country. Mr. Beard concluded by an eloquent panegyric on Mr. Martineau.

Rev. BENJAMIN MARDON spoke in support of the amendment, but in the midst of such interruptions that it was not easy to gather distinctly what he said.

Mr. WILLIAM RAYNER WOOD said that the statement that the Protest contained matters foreign to the principle of religious liberty was utterly unfounded. He would as soon cut off his right hand as do anything contrary to that principle. In selecting Theological Professors, it was surely a material question whether the gentlemen thought of were in all respects the best qualified to instruct their future ministers. As to the opinions of those gentlemen, it was a question he did not want to discuss. To one of them, Mr. Tayler, he was most warmly attached. He had been for many years a hearer of Mr. Tayler, and he knew not only his opinions, but his mode of communicating them. Now there was an ear-

* C. R., June, 1853, p. 405.

† C. R., July, 1853, p. 471.

‡ Inquirer, July, Aug., 1853, *passim*.

nessness of mind in him that led him, when discussing opinions in which he was interested, unconsciously into a kind of dogmatism. If he wanted to realize to his mind the calm and dignified impartiality that became a Professor of Theology, he was led by his recollections to Mr. Wellbeloved. But Mr. Tayler entirely wanted the qualities of mind which that distinguished man possessed. Much as he respected and admired Mr. Tayler as a man and a scholar, he must say he should not like to send his own son to receive instruction from him on the evidences of religion. As to the new duties assigned to Mr. Martineau, they led him to the supposition that it suited Mr. Martineau's convenience and wishes to go to London, and that therefore these duties were contrived for him. He and many others were of the opinion that the appointment of Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau as sole Professors was not the right arrangement for the welfare of the College, and it was right and proper that the opinion should be expressed. It had been said that the Protest was untimely. They should, it was urged, have waited till the Committee had completed and published their intentions. He thought very differently, and that it was a duty they owed both to the College and the Professors to make their objections known as soon as possible. He would only further express his deep regret at the state of things to which the College had been brought. He saw symptoms of widespread alienation of feeling, and he could only anticipate in the course they were pursuing the separation from the College of many old and warmly-attached friends.

Rev. J. H. RYLAND said, so much had been urged against the Protesters, that they must be allowed time to speak. Mr. Thom seemed to think that the meeting of Trustees in January made such expression of their sentiments as to authorize and instruct the Committee to do as they had done. Now certainly his own, and what he should have thought must necessarily have been the general impression was this, viz., that after one party had moved a resolution tending to such specific instruction, and another party moved an amendment which had power to compel the withdrawal of that resolution, the very fact of such prevalence would go forth as instruction to the Committee to do just the reverse. When, therefore, in the next week the Committee met and directly contravened

the spirit of such instruction, why of course there would be a Protest; and so it was. And he knew there were those who, but for the just expectation of the Committee's proceeding to act in accordance with the result of the meeting of Trustees, would have challenged the appointment of officers and members of the Committee. Further, he could not but suppose that Mr. Martineau must have been aware of what was going on. Again, he thought Mr. Martineau had erroneously represented the language of the Protest as setting up a doctrinal test. He thought it ought to be remembered which side had introduced the term "School" at all; he exceedingly disliked it, and did not recognize it. They were not going to forfeit, he would not say their long-boasted, but well-merited, glory of freedom from tests; and he was most glad to see that they were not to witness the confusion into which so many other religious bodies were at this moment thrown by having to entertain similar considerations. He considered the terms "school of thought" did not mean doctrinal results. This was the mistake. All that could be meant by it was a habit or mode of thought, and as such it necessarily formed a part of the actual materials of judgment, one of the qualifications to be fairly considered by those who were called upon to decide on Professors. He would adopt Mr. Thom's own expression, "complexional varieties of mind." Now it seemed to be acknowledged that Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau were of the same complexional variety, while it also seemed to be acknowledged that upon great subjects of thought there were for the most part two distinctive varieties. Surely, then, it is fair and even obvious to remark, that if there be a tendency in both varieties to swerve from the true line, it were better to have each variety, than two of the same. This was all that he understood to be conveyed in that part of the Protest, which had evidently aroused the greatest objection. But he must confess there were to his mind considerations that far outweighed those of schools of thought and results of doctrine: he meant the high moral standard they had always maintained; and he greatly feared, after the exposition they had heard from Mr. Bowman, that, with a foregone conclusion, proceedings had been precipitated to the neglect of such considerations. A great deal had been said of the new Professors. There was another Professor whose name, it appeared, must scarcely be

mentioned at that meeting, but who had been upheld by the highest wisdom and authorities in our body to the last, even to a recommendation to the Committee of January 30th, from both Mr. Tayler and Mr. Kenrick. He could not understand how such venerated wisdom and authority should have been slighted, and, as he thought, such injustice done: and thus it was that he for one had not confidence in the Committee.

Rev. SAMUEL BACHE said that at the annual meeting of Trustees he had felt it a painful duty to take part in the discussion as to the instructions to be given to the Committee on their mode of proceeding in filling the Professorial Chairs of the College. He thought that the motion made by Mr. Mark Philips on that occasion contained an exclusive recommendation of the Bi-professorial scheme to the attention of the Committee, instead of leaving them entirely at liberty to make whatever arrangements might seem to them most desirable; but on receiving a remonstrance from Mr. R.D. Martineau to the effect that Mr. Philips' motion contained no such exclusive recommendation, he had apologized for his statement and expressed his desire to withdraw it. The argument used in behalf of this proposed re-distribution of work was, that there was a *financial necessity*; that the diminution of the College income made it necessary to reduce the staff of Professors. That was denied on his side of the meeting, and an amendment proposed to refer the whole subject to a Special Committee. As nothing like an unanimous vote could be obtained from the Trustees, it was at length decided, and by an overpowering majority, that both the motion and the amendment should be withdrawn, and that the future arrangements should be left entirely to the Committee, — with the understanding, as he supposed (and others thought the same) that the Committee would give every plan suggested, from whatever quarter, a careful and dispassionate attention. He therefore did feel surprise—and, he confessed also, a momentary indignation — when he learned that at their *very first* meeting, this Committee, charged with this responsible duty, had at once proceeded to do that which the whole body of Trustees (seeing the divided feeling that prevailed upon it) had confessed themselves unable to do and precluded from doing; and that they had then proceeded to renounce the very argument on which the Bi-professorial scheme was originally recommended, by voting such augmenta-

tions of expenditure in the Theological department that its future cost would have exceeded the amount hitherto paid to the three Professors. He did think this a most extraordinary, a most unwarrantable proceeding, and one which abundantly justified the course adopted by those Trustees who had joined in the Protest. Against that document the extraordinary charge was brought that its authors were fastening a *creed* upon the College. He entirely denied this. He challenged any one to state what this alleged *creed* is. He had his own creed or belief, which was to him unspeakably valuable; but he repudiated the intention or desire of prescribing it for others. The Trustees were called upon to judge of the fitness or unfitness of certain gentlemen to perform certain academic duties. Now in what way were they to form a judgment in this matter? Evidently by taking into account all the intellectual qualifications of the gentlemen proposed. Now this was a delicate topic—far too delicate for discussion in the midst of a large and excited meeting. There were, too, especial reasons which precluded him from speaking of a relative of his own, beyond expressing the highest respect and affection for him. But he could not sit silent there, and then go home and meet the Trustees of his own district, many of whom were strongly of opinion that the proceedings of the Committee had been rash, without openly maintaining that it was inexpedient and unjust to appoint to the two Chairs gentlemen having one and the same cast of mind, belonging to one and the same "school of thought" (a phrase which he had adopted from one of the avowed advocates of the present arrangements as least likely to be offensive to any one)—and this, too, of a kind that did not (in his judgment) entirely fit either the one gentleman or the other for the efficient performance of some of the most important duties that would devolve upon him.

Rev. R. BROOK ASPLAND said that, notwithstanding the manifest wish of the Trustees to come to a vote, and feeling as he did much embarrassment from addressing an unwilling audience, he could not be satisfied to give a silent vote, and say nothing in behalf of himself and the Protesters in reply to the serious charges brought against them. The most serious charge of all was, that they had by their Protest been false to their foundation principle of religious liberty. If this charge could be proved against them, he for one should feel it to be a stigma of disgrace.

But for himself and those who had acted with him in this matter, he pleaded "Not guilty." It was alleged by Mr. Martineau, and the charge had been repeated that day, that they had endeavoured to interfere with the religious liberty of the Professors and the Trustees, by fastening on the College a creed or standard of "orthodoxy," the more harassing from being undefined. The Protest said nothing of this kind, but just the reverse. Its great argument was, that it was most inexpedient to connect the College exclusively with any one set of opinions, and that to preserve practical freedom, the two Theological Chairs should not be held by men entertaining precisely similar theological views. It was argued, indeed, that the two gentlemen selected as Professors were men that would do equal justice to all opinions, to the views of other men as well as their own. Of those two distinguished men he was not about to say one word derogatory as to their characters, learning or talents. With respect to Mr. Tayler, no one could question his earnestness and sincerity. But the very strength of his convictions might interfere with his power of impartially weighing the value of other opinions. He was expressing no new judgment in this matter. He well remembered, when the Professorial work of the College was to be distributed in 1840, the late Mr. G. W. Wood consulted the Committee as to the desirableness of entrusting the subject of the Evidences of Religion to Mr. Tayler. He (Mr. Aspland) was the first to express the fear that, strong as Mr. Tayler's own faith might be, he might not succeed in conveying a belief as strong to the minds of his pupils, from his want of sympathy with some of the accepted evidences of Christianity. The Committee coincided with that view of the subject, and the course of Evidences was given to another Professor. He was never then charged with violating religious liberty in taking the ground of objection he had. But it might be said that Mr. Tayler's subsequent course as a Professor had proved the fear to be unfounded. He had not had the advantage of attending Mr. Tayler's course of lectures on "Principles and Doctrines," in which he travelled over the Evidence question; but for several years he had been a regular attendant at the Examinations. He had listened with deep attention to the examination of that class, and so far as the answers of the students reflected the opinions of the Professor, he was bound to say that his anticipa-

tions had been realized. To him it seemed that the duties of a Professor of Theology very much resembled those of a Judge. The qualities required in both offices were large knowledge, a calm temperament and sound judgment. Very different qualities were needed to make a brilliant advocate. With respect to Mr. Martineau, he knew of no living man in any of the professions who possessed in greater strength the powers needed by an advocate—the power of stating a case, acuteness of logic in reasoning on it, brilliant imagination, earnestness of manner, and a mastery over men's judgments. If these were the qualities which befitted and adorned a Chair of Theology, they had acted wisely in selecting Mr. Martineau. There was, too, another function of the advocate which that gentleman possessed—versatility. No man could throw himself with greater success, and within a very short period, into the advocacy of two opposing opinions. The opinion for which he argued to-day with wonderful earnestness and force of logic, would be in direct opposition to that for which he not less warmly and ably argued yesterday. This habit sprang, he believed, from no want of sincerity, from no deficiency of preliminary inquiry, but from an inherent intellectual love of novelty. He could not but apprehend injurious results to young and partially-trained minds from this vacillation of one of their Theological Professors. Looking at the ruling tastes, acquirements and opinions of both Professors, he could not but apprehend that there was some danger of Biblical knowledge being made subordinate to philosophical speculation. Their curriculum of instruction needed no addition in the matter of philosophy. If he rightly judged, it was already too heavily weighted with metaphysics. Metaphysics were the bane of their pulpits. The less they had of them there, the better for the people. As it was, so perplexed were the minds of some of the alumni of the College with metaphysical doubts, that they sometimes had to go through a year of *quarantine* before they were fit for ministerial duty. (Interruption.) He spoke of what he knew. And now he observed with deep regret that this metaphysical element was, instead of being retrenched, about to be carried into the field of Theology. The scheme of the Professors, published in the Special Report, described a new course, for which, unless they resorted to German terms, they could find no proper distinctive term. As it had, however, been

explained to the Committee by one of the friends of the Professor, its aim would be to expound the philosophy of Christian doctrine, to shew what essential truth was to be found underlying every doctrinal error and corruption. Now he anticipated mischief from this metaphysical hunting after a grain of truth in a bushel of error. It might in some cases minister to theological charity; but, on the other hand, was there no danger in it to integrity of conscience? Were there not some eminent men in the Established Church at the present time, whose theological sympathies ought to have led them into open Nonconformity, and who vindicated their retention of their places in a Church from whose Articles and Creeds they largely dissented, by pointing to the grains of truth which those symbols contained? Might not a similar habit of mind have had something to do with the recent secession from the Unitarian pulpit of a gentleman who had been till lately a warm partizan of their two Professors? He (Mr. A.) was grateful for the opportunity the Trustees had given him of explaining the grounds of his opposition to the proceedings of the Committee. Whether right or wrong, they were his sincere convictions, and as an honest man he had been compelled, though not without painful feelings, to give utterance to them in the Protest. One word he wished to say in conclusion, and here he should be obliged to separate himself from his valued friend, Mr. W. R. Wood. Whatever the decision of the Trustees that day might be, it was his intention to hold on to the College. He could not bear the thought that an Institution so catholic in its principles should merely speak the language of any one school. He should therefore wait in faith of a better day to come. He had great confidence in the essential justice of the Unitarian body, and not less in their firm adherence to Christian truth; and hereafter, should his fears of the mischievousness of the present course of the Trustees prove too well founded, they would unite with him and others in discovering and applying a remedy.

Rev. Noah Jones, Rev. Edmund Kell and Mr. E. W. Field, also spoke. The latter read a letter from Rev. Dr. Sadler, earnestly recommending Mr. Martineau as a Professor of Theology.

The Chairman then requested the two parties to occupy different sides of the building. A few Trustees left the chapel without voting, but the majority was very large on the side of the Committee. The names of the Trustees, as they voted,

on each side were taken down. The amendment having been negatived, the Chairman reported that the numbers for the original resolution stood thus:

For	113
Against	17

Majority 96

Subsequently, two other resolutions were proposed, and though objected to by some of the Trustees who had voted in the majority (most of the minority had now left the chapel) as unnecessary and ill-timed, were carried, after being supported by Mr. Field, Mr. Shaen and Mr. Thom, and opposed by Mr. Thomas Grundy, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Mr. Avison and others. The resolutions were:—1. "That the official recognition of Protests tends to weaken and render unstable the government of the College, and that such documents should not in future be recorded as part of the College minutes."—2. "That this Institution is founded for the sole purpose of giving University learning to students for the Christian ministry amongst Non-subscribing Dissenters, without test or confession of faith, and not for the purpose of instruction in the peculiar doctrines of any sect; and that in appointing Professors it would be a violation of this fundamental principle to attempt to secure a representation of the views of any particular school of thought."

On the motion of Rev. Dr. Beard, who panegyricized the Committee and Mr. Martineau as the only man in the body fit for the vacant Chair, copies of the resolutions were ordered to be sent to the two Professors. The thanks of the Trustees were given to the Chairman, and the meeting dispersed a little after five o'clock.

About sixty of the Trustees afterwards dined together at the Queen's Hotel, and, under the presidency of Mr. Mark Philips, passed a very harmonious and pleasant evening, being addressed by Rev. Charles Wicksteed, Mr. H. C. Robinson, Rev. Edward Talbot, Rev. Chas. Beard, Mr. R. N. Philips, M. P., and others.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL
ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary of this Society was celebrated on Good Friday, April 10, at Gee Cross and Flowery Field. Shortly before eleven o'clock numerous bands of Sunday-school teachers and their friends began to pour into the village of Gee Cross from a large proportion of the

accessible towns which contain Unitarian congregations in the two counties of Lancaster and Chester. Amongst the ministers present were Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. John Wright, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. James Bayley, Rev. C. W. Robberds, Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. L. Taplin, Rev. J. C. M'Alester, Rev. J. J. Bishop, Rev. J. Davis, Rev. Henry Green and Rev. R. Brook Aspland. The chapel was filled by an intelligent and a deeply-attentive audience. The religious service was conducted in a manner that gave general satisfaction by the Rev. J. C. M'Alester, of Holywood, in the county of Down, and Secretary of the Irish Sunday-School Association. His sermon was founded on the words of Christ to Peter, John xxi. 15, "Feed my lambs."

At the close of the service the congregation remained and formed themselves into a public meeting, the chair being taken by Mr. EDDOWES BOWMAN. He said that it was two years since he had had the pleasure of acting as their President. The arrangement now adopted of proceeding at once to the business of the Society had the considerable advantage of keeping all the audience together, and thus ensuring the attendance of numerous friends. The beautiful discourse to which they had been listening was a good preparation for their work. It impressed them with the importance of the work they had undertaken, and filled them with the spirit that enabled them to do it well. It rendered it the less necessary for him to dwell on the general subject of Sunday-school education. He knew of no better motto than the preacher's text, "Feed my lambs." An active agitation was going on in the country, which might result in extending the blessings of education to all children, yet it could not be doubted that at present there were many children who but for the Sunday-school would come very short of elementary education. The homes of many of the poor were not merely places in which they could receive nothing that deserved the name of education, but in which all influences at work were purely evil. The Sunday-school was often the only agency that could save the children of such homes from ruin. But Sunday-schools were useful to others besides children. They were valuable to many just verging on manhood and womanhood, who, having passed the period of early childhood, were about to take their places in helping on the actual business of life. The Sunday-school did the good work to those young persons in keeping them away from the society of the vicious,

and in maintaining their interest in virtue and religion. It kept them during the most critical years of human life under direct Christian influence. Another important effect of a Sunday-school was, that it was the nursery of a congregation. It ought from the first to be so regarded, and to this end all its arrangements should be auxiliary. They ought first to feed the lambs, and then to watch with religious care the sheep of the fold. It was very satisfactory to him and his friends around him to see so large an assemblage that day of actual teachers. The numbers at their anniversaries might somewhat fluctuate, but there had always been manifested on the part of a large number of their colleagues a determination to persevere in the good work on which they had entered. Their annual gatherings were cheering and useful. They had the opportunity of deliberating and consulting with practical persons as to the best mode of effecting an important work. As the Sunday-school from week to week sustained the intelligence and spirit of the pupils, so these annual meetings helped to keep up the intelligence and energy of their teachers. To one subject of a less cheerful nature he was compelled to allude. They would all regret the enforced absence, through illness, of their excellent Treasurer, Mr. Curtis. They would join with their Chairman in wishing that his visit to the South of England, where he would enjoy not only rest from his arduous toils, but a milder climate than Manchester had to bestow, might, under Providence, be the means of restoring him at no distant day to the wishes of his friends and the responsibilities and duties of which he was the centre.

Mr. JEFFREY WORTHINGTON read the Committee's report, which stated that during the past year the attention of the Committee has been directed to the affairs of the Sunday-School Penny Magazine. In October, a letter was received from the editor advising its discontinuance, in consequence of the exhaustion of the fund and the loss that was taking place upon the publication. It was resolved to continue the publication for at least a year, in the mean time reducing the size and cost of the work, and also to try the effect of introducing pictorial illustrations. It was also resolved to raise a capital fund of £50, towards which the Committee made a grant of £45 from the funds of the Association, the amount being raised to the required sum by a few donations. A successful effort has been made to in-

crease the sale of the work, which now reaches 7000 copies per month. The average number circulated during the six last years has been 5971 copies a month. The present condition of the Magazine may therefore be regarded with satisfaction. The report then proceeded to state what the sales of the other publications of the Association had been.—The Visiting department of the Association has been under the care of Mr. Freestone. Four visits each have been paid to the schools at Dob Lane, Hurst Brook, and Astley Street, Dukinfield. Two visits each have been paid to Mottram, Heap Bridge (Bury), Oldham and Flowery Field; while the schools at Commercial Road, Macclesfield, Park Lane, Lower Mosley Street, Manchester, Bury, Swinton and Newchurch, have received each one visit. The good effects of a single visit are not always visible; it has therefore been thought desirable, when possible, to follow it up by a second and a third. In several of the schools the teachers have formed themselves into classes, and a course of lessons on some subject connected with teaching has been given them. This plan of visiting the schools has rendered it impossible to visit all those connected with the Association during the past year. Arrangements are made for the Visitor to deliver week-evening lectures to teachers and elder scholars. In accordance with Mr. William Symons's suggestion, a circular has been sent to the schools, advising them to form in connection with each school a fund for the benefit of destitute orphans connected therewith. The proposed Teachers' Library has been established during the year, and annotated catalogues circulated, but the demand has not been great. Two conferences of the Directors of the Sunday-schools have taken place during the year, at which various questions relating to the management of Sunday-schools have been considered. The returns from the different schools will speak as to their condition. A new column has been added, stating the number of classes in each school. Particulars have also, at the suggestion of Mr. James Heywood, been given regarding the kind of instruction imparted in the various schools. The Committee regret that the Bolton Sunday-school has withdrawn from the Association. The report concluded with expressing the hope of the Committee that the Manchester District Sunday-School Association may long continue to prove its value, by affording encouragement and opportunities of mutual sympathy to members

engaged in the laborious and Christian work of the religious education of the young.

From the tabular statement appended to the report, it appeared that the number of the teachers in the schools connected with the Association was 1135, a somewhat smaller number than that given last year; while the number of the scholars was 7554, an increase. The average attendance of the scholars was about 5440.

Mr. J. C. Herford read the Treasurer's report, from which it appeared that from various sources the income of the Society during the year, including a balance to begin with of £28, had amounted to £90. 17s. 5d. The expenses had been rather more than £75. The present balance is £15. 6s. 5d.

The usual resolutions were then passed. On the motion of Rev. Charles Beard, seconded by Rev. R. B. Aspland, the cordial thanks of the meeting were given to the preacher of the day for his appropriate and interesting sermon. The presence of Mr. J. C. Lawrence, as a deputation from the Sunday-School Association of London, was an interesting feature of the meeting. His attendance was the occasion of a resolution, proposed by the Rev. T. E. Poynting and seconded by Rev. John Wright, offering him, on personal as well as public grounds, a hearty welcome. In acknowledging the vote passed by the meeting, Mr. Lawrence explained the objects of the Society which he represented to be the supply of a want, strongly felt by those engaged in Sunday-schools, by the publication of a series of suitable manuals. This their means had only partially enabled them to do, but the value of many of their publications was practically acknowledged by their wide acceptance. He hoped the friends of the Manchester Society would co-operate with the Parent Society, and especially that they would send up a deputation to their Whitsuntide anniversary. On the motion of the Rev. C. W. Robberds, the next meeting was fixed to be held at Chowbent on Good Friday, 1858.—The company then proceeded to the school-rooms, where about 250 persons partook of a plain but comfortable dinner. The purpose of taking a ramble on the heights of Werne Low, the fine hill which rises to the south of the village of Gee Cross, was frustrated by a thunder-storm. Some of the guests found hospitable shelter in the convenient parsonage attached to the chapel, erected about the middle of the last century, in which Pendlebury

Houghton, son of Rev. John Houghton, then minister of Gee Cross, was born. Others found shelter in the chapel, the various beauties of which they had time to examine. Particular attention was given to a handsome mural tablet, recently put up by the congregation, to the memory of their late minister :

In pious Memory of JAMES BROOKS,
Some time Minister of Christ's Holy Gospel in this place ;

A diligent Pastor, a zealous Preacher of the Word ;

A useful Citizen, a humble Christian :
This Tablet

Is erected by a grateful and affectionate Congregation.

He entered upon his Ministry at Hyde Chapel, February 16th, 1806 ;

He died April 4th, 1854, in the 49th year of his successful labours,

In the 78th year of his age.

Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they shall be called the Children of God !

As soon as the weather permitted, the teachers and their friends proceeded to Flowery Field. In the spacious school-rooms there (erected by that generous friend of every good cause, the late Thos. Ashton) the party, now increased to nearly 500 persons, took tea. Here also attention was directed to a rich mural tablet, in white marble, containing this inscription :

Sacred to the Memory of

THOMAS ASHTON, Esq.,

Who died August 27, 1845, in the 70th year of his age.

During a long, active and eminently successful life,

He was distinguished by his encouragement of honest industry,

By his support of local improvements, And by his judicious and liberal efforts

To extend the education,

Elevate the morals, and

Increase the happiness of his neighbours.

This Tablet is consecrated to his Memory

By his Workpeople and Friends.

The chair was filled by Mr. THOMAS ASHTON, who in an introductory speech apologized for any shortcomings in the material arrangements of the evening, the number of the guests having so far exceeded all their anticipations, and then gave a very cordial welcome to the teachers and friends present, some of whom he was gratified to learn had shewn their interest in the meeting by travelling a considerable distance to join it. After describing the arrangements for the evening and urging brevity on the

speakers, that all appointed to address the meeting might be heard, he called on Mr. Freestone, the Visitor of the schools, to give some account of his year's doings.

The Visitor said, although he had paid during the year between thirty and forty visits, he had not attempted to visit every school. He found it a more profitable plan to pay several visits in succession to the same school. He expressed his willingness to give week-evening lectures on the the practice of teaching, and wished arrangements always to be made beforehand for his visits, that he might meet as many of the teachers as possible. He also gave an account of some of the improved modes of teaching the elements of knowledge ; but his remarks were not exclusively directed to the teaching proper to a Sunday-school.

Rev. JOHN WRIGHT then addressed the meeting on the subject assigned to him, " The best Plan of Government of a Sunday-school." Good government had a great effect on the harmony and usefulness of a school. It was most important that the plan of organization should be publicly known, that it should be understood in whose hands the executive power dwelt, and by what means it should be exercised. For twenty years he had been acquainted with Sunday-schools, and in many cases he had seen how evils arose from the want of due consideration of these things. He had been sometimes pained to witness misunderstandings between teachers and scholars, between the school and the congregation,—evils which might have been entirely obviated by early and judicious attention to the governing plan of the school. He defined a Sunday-school to be a voluntary association for the purpose of the religious instruction of the young. Every voluntary association must have certain fundamental rules, to which all concerned must pay respect. Every prudent person will inquire what are the laws to which he makes himself amenable. Most of our Sunday-schools lack a constitution. They have laws for the scholars, but here the regulations end. This state of things ought to be remedied. They ought to look their difficulties (if such there were) honestly in the face. He should lay it down as a first principle that the power in a Sunday-school, both legislative and executive, principally resided in the hands of the teachers. Those who met for a certain work must clearly have the power to decide what the work should be and how it should be carried

out. They must have the power of changing their laws of action. On no other terms can you expect to find men of an earnest spirit willing to give their energies to a work. You cannot deny them the power of making the improvements which they think are desirable. The ordinary routine of a Sunday-school must be decided by the wishes of the majority of the teachers. Other things, indeed, are needed besides teachers; for instance, money. This comes from a wider area than the teachers—either from the congregation, or from persons subscribing, or from two or three individuals. The subscribers to a school have some claim to participate in its management. Hence the formation of a committee. It is reasonable that each year a committee should be appointed to hold the purse-strings. Two things are essential: 1. The committee should consist of persons who are practically versed in the business of a school. 2. The committee must not be a drag on the wishes of the teachers, nor work in complete opposition to them. They must only interfere when they see something actually wrong. There is a third party that sometimes claims the right of interference; he meant the trustees. Their duty is to watch over the building, and to see that it is employed in effecting the purposes for which it was erected. A delicate question for consideration was, what is the natural and proper position of a minister in his Sunday-school? Wherever a school is connected with a congregation, the minister will naturally take a prominent part. Most of their ministers were teachers in a Sunday-school. In all such cases the minister would naturally and as a matter of course take a lead amongst them. His advice, his warnings, will always be listened to with due attention. If there be cases in which ministers are not teachers, they cannot be expected to be so directly interested. They would be of course consulted on many points—would naturally have much influence. He for one did not fear ministers not having accorded to them all the influence to which they were entitled. The minister is the first amongst equals, but will be careful himself to conform to the laws of the institution. Supposing every school to possess, what it certainly ought to have, a well-defined code of laws, one of the matters carefully prescribed will be, the mode in which teachers receive their appointment. There should always be care in appointing teachers: there should be an ordeal through which

a candidate for the teacher's office should invariably pass, to the satisfaction of the directors of the school. The code should not only prescribe the mode of appointing teachers, but should with equal clearness define their duties. Due provision should also be made for the mode of proceeding when the laws need to be altered. There should be periodical meetings for conducting the business of the schools. At these meetings all matters growing out of the conduct of the schools should be discussed and decided. The laws agreed upon should be signed by every teacher. There should be an annual meeting for the appointment of the school officers. Every officer should be responsible for the duties assigned to him. There must be no needless interference with the individual actions of a teacher. If the work is on the whole well done, we must carefully abstain from interfering with him, though his mode of proceeding may be peculiar to himself. It must be remembered that in a Sunday-school it was impossible to secure the same unbroken routine and strict mechanical rule which in a day-school it was desirable to obtain. He had brought before them a subject of some importance, one that he trusted would be talked about and thought upon; the hints he had thrown out might assist those that already possessed a code of laws to improve them; and those that had none would, he hoped, be induced by what he had said to lose no time in obtaining one.

Mr. J. C. LAWRENCE, after some observations on Mr. Wright's suggestions, and a detail of the objects of the Society in London which had sent him amongst them as their delegate, proceeded to say, that education was happily making rapid progress; but however it might advance, the existence and object of Sunday-schools would not be affected. If relieved from the necessity of teaching the mere elements of knowledge, the Sunday-school would be the better able to devote itself to its proper work, the communication of religious knowledge and the training of the religious affections. Teachers in a Sunday-school needed often to be reminded what their work was, and how they could best prepare themselves for it. When the teacher found his work not going on satisfactorily, he ought to suspect that the fault lay in part with himself. He may talk of duty and earnestness, but without religious affections in his own heart, they would soon grow cold. A teacher would soon feel the want of power, un-

less he went to the source of all strength. There was, he feared, a deficient piety amongst them. In discarding some things from the fear of cant and hypocrisy, they had perhaps lost some elements of moral and religious power. The teacher, when embarrassed or disheartened, should seek guidance and solace in communion with his Heavenly Father. If he has earnestly sought for strength, has he not come away strengthened and improved? If such were the religious habits of all who took part in the conduct of our schools, they would presently take a start and achieve results, intellectual, moral and spiritual, far beyond anything they had yet seen or ventured to hope for.

At the call of the Chairman, Mr. JAS. ROBINSON, of Mossley, as a practical teacher, described the state of their schools, containing upwards of 1200 scholars. The large building they had erected on Mossley Brow was rapidly becoming too small for their school wants. If asked to account for their success, he should attribute it all to their love of freedom and progress. They were bound by nothing but what they found by experience to be good, and they went on making constant changes, only taking care that every change was an improvement. They had found teachers able and willing to give valuable instruction to their classes. In their neighbourhood, every Sunday-school that would be successful must mingle a certain portion of secular instruction. They taught many subjects—grammar, geography, astronomy, history; but they did not find it difficult to give a religious turn to every branch of instruction. He congratulated the Society on the more cheerful tone that prevailed. Last year their report was very discouraging. Then Mr. Wright seemed ready to hang his harp on the willows; but to-day he might cheerfully unite with them in singing the song of the Lord.

After a short address from Mr. Woods, of Macclesfield, Rev. CHARLES BEARD, after some words of renewed welcome to the friends around him, alluded to the seven years of service in that school, in which, during the winter months, he had, after his two services at Gee Cross, conducted a religious service from that pulpit to an attentive and intelligent congregation, many of whom were scholars and teachers. To return to the subject offered for their discussion, he wished to make a few suggestions in a different strain from those of the friend who had preceded him. He had an increasing

distrust in mere organization, and an increasing confidence in personal earnestness and the force of individual character. A Sunday-school is only a provisional arrangement, which must be worked out with at best imperfect instruments. No system of government would of itself produce the best results, and none could be constructed of universal applicability. Under almost any constitution, if there were the true spirit of devoted love, the teachers would go on cheerfully in their work, and win a great success. Mr. Wright had said that every minister ought to be a Sunday-school teacher. He begged to put in his protest against this dictum. To him it seemed that when a minister began to teach the merest elements of knowledge, he ceased to occupy his right place. The great object set before a minister is to preach the living word of God. To decline from a higher work to undertake a lower, was to put himself out of his proper place. He had till lately taught in his Sunday-school. He did not now teach, but he managed a Savings' Bank in the school. He did not think this was the right duty for him to undertake. There were many members of his congregation who could do this as well as or better than himself, but he did not think there were any members of his congregation who could preach as well as he could. He could be of far greater use to his congregation, if they would allow him, than by working in the Sunday-school. He could give them a course of systematic theological instruction such as could only be obtained within the walls of a University. His duty as a Christian minister is to take the highest duty, not the lowest—the most difficult, not the most easy. He was aware his line of remark was unpopular, but it might for all that be not the less true. Congregations and Sunday-school teachers expect too much from their minister, and give him far too little help. They expected that their minister should be the centre of his own whole spiritual life. It ought to be generated in their hearts and flow back to him. They expected their minister to be here, there and everywhere. It was the proper work of a minister to keep himself in the van of theological thought, and if he is to do it properly, he must not be asked to do the work of the congregation also. It is no easy thing for a minister to build up in his own soul the Christian's spiritual life. If they constantly compelled him to labour with his hands, how could he labour with his soul? In expecting these things they

committed the mistake made by the early Christians, who complained that the apostles were so occupied with the preaching of the gospel, that they neglected the ministration to the widows: the reply was the ordination of deacons to attend to the poor. It was the duty of ministers to live the gospel and to preach the gospel; and what he wanted the laity to do was to make themselves deacons, and so to leave their ministers time and spiritual strength to make themselves apostles.

Rev. J. C. M'ALESTER expressed the extreme gratification which the proceedings of the day had afforded him. He believed he owed to the fact of his being an officer of the Northern Sunday-School Association, the privilege of his being with them that day. Their Irish brethren cherished no feelings of rivalry, but watched with lively interest their success. In criticising Mr. Wright's legislative principles, he felt that the circumstances of their Irish schools were very different from those in England. But however they might differ in some of the details of their institutions, their principles and their aim were one and the same. He should go back to Ireland with his heart cheered with the proofs which had crowded upon him that day of the zeal and the true Christian spirit of his English Unitarian brethren.

After a few words from Rev. Francis Bishop and Rev. H. Green, the meeting was brought to a close by a hymn and prayer.—In conclusion, it is a simple act of justice to state, that the arrangements of the whole day, depending on the members of the Gee-Cross congregation and on the teachers of the Flowery-Field school, were marked by provident fore-

thought, and were executed with hospitable success. Mr. Orlando Oldham, the chapel-warden of Gee Cross, superintended the arrangements there with his customary energy. The teachers separated, feeling that they had been privileged to enjoy a day of intellectual and true Christian pleasure.

THE NEXT PROVINCIAL MEETING.

This meeting was fixed last year to be held at Stand, but several circumstances, including the want of hotel accommodation in the village, and the probable absence of Mr. R. N. Philips (in a manner so unexpectedly and so honourably to himself chosen as their Representative in Parliament by his neighbours, the electors of Bury), make it inexpedient that the meeting should take place as proposed. The Committee have therefore, under the circumstances, and after conferring with the Rev. John Colston, fixed the Assembly at Dean Row, an ancient Presbyterian foundation. The Assembly will take place on Thursday, June 18th. The preacher is Rev. T. E. Poynting; the supporter, Rev. J. Pantom Ham. The subject of Popular Education, especially the plan developed by Mr. Thos. Wrigley, is recommended by the Committee as the subject for discussion.

It will be borne in mind that the new constitution of the Society is to take effect this year, and that each congregation in the two counties is entitled to send three delegates, and that the power of voting will be confined to them and to the ministers. The delegates should be without delay appointed by the congregations.

OBITUARY.

Feb. 15, EMMA SARAH, daughter of the late John FELLOWS, Esq., of Nottingham.

Feb. 27, at Dukinfield, in the 80th year of his age, Mr. JOSEPH HARROP, farmer.

March 4, in the 76th year of his age and the 52nd of his ministry, Rev. EBENEZER GLOSSOP, minister of Chinley chapel, in the county of Derby. This much-respected minister was, we believe, the first Independent minister at Chinley chapel, which was until his election to the pulpit a Presbyterian place of worship.

April 1, aged 76, ELIZABETH RIDDELL, the eldest daughter of the late Thomas Blackmore, Esq., of Pittlesden, Tenterden, Kent. She was for many years a sincere and constant worshiper in the Unitarian chapel. She has left a daughter to deplore her loss, and is much regretted by all her friends.

April 15, at Bridport, Dorset, after a week's illness, of malignant sore throat, HERBERT LETTIS, the beloved and only son of the Rev. John Lettis and Amelia Anne SHORT, aged 6 years and 11 months.